
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2021

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/21/3274469

6 Hampton Gardens, Sawbridgeworth, Hertfordshire CM21 0AN

- 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 Ernest Onyema against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/20/2502/HH was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension above existing double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Policy HOU11 in the East Herts District Plan (2018) generally requires residential extensions to be subservient additions. In addition, it seeks to ensure that side extensions at first floor level or above ensure appropriate space is left between the flank wall of an extension and the common curtilage with a neighbouring property to safeguard the character and appearance of the street scene and prevent a visually damaging 'terracing' effect. As a general rule a space of one metre is the minimum acceptable. Policy DES4 seeks a high standard of design and layout.
 4. The appeal property is a modern two-storey dwelling situated in a corner of a small residential cul-de-sac. Modern dwellings of similar design in close proximity to each other are a characteristic of this cul-de-sac. The single-storey garages break up the built form at first floor level in an area of high density development.
 5. The ridgeline of the proposed first floor extension would be set down from the main ridge by some 0.5 metres. It would be clad in fibre cement weatherboarding. It would have a half hipped roof to match the existing roof, incorporating two pitched roof dormers on the south elevation. No gap is
-

proposed between the flank wall of the proposed first floor extension and the party boundary with No 5 Hampton Gardens. As such, due to the size, design and location of the proposal it would appear as an excessively bulky extension to the dwelling. This would not be a subservient addition. Whilst I appreciate that the proposal would not be widely visible, the close proximity to No. 5 Hampton Gardens would create an unacceptably cramped form of development in this corner of the cul-de-sac.

6. There is weatherboarding on part of the first floor of the neighbouring property at No. 5 Hampton Gardens. Therefore, the proposed use of weatherboarding would be in keeping with the appearance of this corner of the cul-de-sac. However, in the light of my concerns above, this does not justify allowing the appeal.
7. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised upon which I have not made specific comment, including examples of extensions to other properties in Hampton Gardens. Those extensions are not in such a confined location as the proposal before me. I have determined the proposal on its individual merits. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to District Plan Policies HOU11 and DES4. I consider these policies to be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework where they seek to ensure good design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR