



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/21/3288843

55 King Edward's Road, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12 7EJ

- 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 and Mrs Demicoli against the decision of East Herts District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/21/2131/HH, dated 12 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2021.
 - The proposed development is for single storey side extension and proposed front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey side extension and proposed front porch at 55 King Edward's Road, Ware in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 3/21/2131/HH dated 12 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 782-2-PLN-601 and 782-2-COM-600.
 - iii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Appellant's application form. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development is the same as this description and neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that this description is erroneous. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original planning application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a light rendered end of terrace house that is located at the corner of King Edward's Road and Bowling Road. The property already contains a two storey rear extension and modest two storey side extension that may be original to the house. There is also a single storey rear extension along the boundary to number 53 King Edwards Road and a detached garage to the rear of the plot. I also saw on my site visit that a single storey side extension with pitched roof was extant on the site and this is part subject of this appeal.
5. It appears that the property already has permission for a single storey side extension with flat roof and parapet wall within the same or very similar location to where the current side extension is located. The main difference in this appeal is the fact that the roof of the extension has been altered from a flat roof to a pitched roof with rooflights. There is also the inclusion in the proposal to construct a lean to, timber frame porch to the front end of the side elevation.
6. In assessing this appeal I am aware of the overriding character of the area of the appeal site in what is a relatively densely populated area of terrace and semi detached houses, the vast majority of which exhibit diverse but complimentary design attributes. I consider that one of these attributes is the simplicity of traditional roof forms and details that include simple pitched or mono pitched roofs either over front bay windows, to rear outshot extensions or, sometimes where space allows, to the sides of properties.
7. I consider that the proposal before me utilises these design prompts in the proposed design and therefore I find no conflict between the extension as erected and the character and appearance of the area as a whole. Indeed, I would go so far as to suggest that a lean too pitched roof would be preferable to that of a flat roof that could be seen as something of an alien intervention into the area as well as having the potential to appear more over dominant. Similarly I find no cumulative harm through the simple forms and design of the proposed porch extension for the same reasons.
8. Although both these extensions would be visible from the streetscene to some degree, I consider that they do represent an appropriate design response to this context that they would not appear unduly prominent, awkward or intrusive. As such I conclude that the requirements for good residential and household design quality contained within Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, have been duly met.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions outlined above that I am satisfied meet the requirements outlined within the Planning Practice Guidance.

A Graham

INSPECTOR