



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 December 2020

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/20/3257797

68 Gilders, Sawbridgeworth CM21 0EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Davison against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/20/0838/HH, dated 30 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is additions to roof and internal alterations to create a four bedroomed dwelling. Creating a new vehicular crossover to accommodate two cars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for additions to roof and internal alterations to create a four bedroomed dwelling. Creating a new vehicular crossover to accommodate two cars at 68 Gilders, Sawbridgeworth CM21 0EH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/20/0838/HH, dated 30 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BRD/18/027/002-B and BRD/18/027/005-A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials specified on the planning application form and/or submitted drawings.

Procedural Matters

2. Extensions and alterations to the appeal property were initially granted by way of a previously allowed appeal¹ and the Council subsequently granted an application for amendments to that scheme². However, the appellant unsuccessfully applied to retain development that was not constructed in accordance with the approved scheme³. The application subject of this appeal relates to an alternative scheme to alter the development in situ.
3. In light of the above, parts of the proposal have already been granted planning permission. These include alterations to the height of parts of the roof and the external finish of the dwelling, the omission of rooflights and dormer windows, and the insertion of additional window openings and a Juliet balcony. I note

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/18/3203275 in connection with planning application reference 3/18/0512/HH.

² Planning Reference: 3/19/0797/VAR.

³ Planning Reference: 3/20/0231/HH.

that the Council's concerns do not lie with regard to those aspects of the proposal, instead they focus on the alterations to the part of the roof between the existing approved twin gables that would face the main section of Gilders. As it is those alterations that are at issue between the main parties, and with cognisance of the extant permissions, I will focus on that aspect of the proposal in my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal concerns a detached chalet-style bungalow situated at the junction of a cul-de-sac and main section of Gilders. The properties in the surrounding area are characterised by bungalows, chalet bungalows or two storey houses of varying designs. There is no consistency to the overall appearance and layout of the bungalows, primarily as a result of alterations and extensions, but roof have greater uniformity, with gables utilised throughout the surrounding area.
6. The alterations and extensions undertaken to the property have resulted in a significant amount of change to the dwelling. However, I am mindful that the flat roof currently in situ could be removed and the approved twin gables formed with a valley between, outside the scope of this appeal.
7. Policy HOU11 of the Council's Local Plan⁴ is the policy relevant to extensions and alterations to dwellings and requires that they are designed in a manner appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the existing dwelling and/or the surrounding area. The policy does therefore not appear to require proposals to be considered in relation to the original dwelling, except in relation to flat roofed extensions. Given the amount of change already undertaken and that could be undertaken with the approved scheme, were development to be completed in accordance with the approved scheme that would constitute the 'existing dwelling'.
8. The proposal would not incorporate a conventional flat roof, as the roof slope between the twin gables would give rise to a form of crown roof. While this would evidently be in contrast to the simpler form of gables found on existing dwelling and nearby, it would appear as a subservient addition to its roof. Moreover, the principal gable-ended roof of the dwelling would be visible behind and the twin gables would be separated, so they would still create visual interest in the street scene.
9. I am also mindful of the much larger flat-topped roof to the rear extension of No 66. While I am not aware of the circumstances that led to that extension and it is less prominent than the appeal proposal, it adds to the particular context and suitability of the proposal.
10. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Hence, the proposal would accord with the design aims of Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the Council's Local Plan.

⁴ East Herts District Plan (Adopted October 2018).

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit for the appeal, in the interests of clarity and the appearance of the existing house, I have specified the approved plans and that the materials of construction of the proposal should be in accordance with the materials listed in the application.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR