



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/22/3297738

19 Mayflower Gardens, Bishops Stortford, CM23 4PA

- 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 Mrs D Marriott against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application Ref 3/22/0114/HH, dated 19 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, infill extension and removal of garage roof with a new pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension with link infill extension and raising pitched roof of existing garage at 19 Mayflower Gardens, Bishops Stortford, CM23 4PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/22/0114/HH, dated 19 January 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Drawing Number - D210203/1; and Drawing Number - D210203/2 D.
 - 3) 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 the development used in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, I have noted that the description given in the both Council's decision notice and appeal form is slightly different. In my opinion, these give a clearer description of the proposal and, therefore, I have used this wording in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with a detached double garage, which is situated within a modern housing development. The property is positioned on a corner plot and it is relatively prominent in the streetscene. Dwellings in the vicinity of the site vary in terms of their size and design. I also noted during my site visit that garages within the estate vary with some being integral, some attached and others detached. However, I note that the Council points to garages nearby being either detached or integral.
5. The proposal is to infill the existing space between the garage and the side wall of the dwelling, raise the height of the garage and construct an extension at the rear of the garage linked to the dwelling. The proposal has been submitted to try and overcome the Council's refusal of a previous application for a larger and taller extension that would have resulted in the extended garage being two storeys in height.
6. The Council considers that the appeal proposal would be a bulky and unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling, which would be visually intrusive in the streetscene. It also points to it being out of character with other garaging nearby which are mainly detached or integral. As such, the Council states that the proposal would conflict with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 (DP) and with Policy HDP2 of the Bishops Stortford's Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads (NP). Amongst other things, these policies generally seek to ensure that the design of extensions are of a high standard and appropriate to their surroundings in terms of scale, mass, form and siting.
7. Although the proposed garage extension would be clearly visible when viewed from the front and side, I do not agree that it would appear out of scale or visually harmful. Notwithstanding the fact that it would be attached to the dwelling, it would appear subservient because of its lower roof height when viewed from the front. The roof of the garage would also slope upwards away from the dwelling, thereby retaining a gap between the ridge of the garage roof and the side wall the house at first-floor level. I accept that there would be added bulk when viewed from the side and that this would be visible in the streetscene. However, much of this view would be screened or softened by existing planting.
8. In my opinion, the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of either the dwelling or the streetscene. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the relevant policies of the DP and the NP, as referred to above.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the time period for the commencement of the development and specifying the approved plans, I have also imposed a condition that requires the use of external materials to match the existing dwelling. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR