



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/22/3294741

7 The Bungalow, Hay Street, Braughing, SG11 2RJ

- 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 T Strachan against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application Ref 3/21/2648/HH, dated 8 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey and first floor rear extension. Two front dormers. Recladding with shiplap. Rear terrace, external steps and fencing. Replacement windows and doors. New ground floor side door and new front windows added to porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring property, with particular regard to outlook, natural light and privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an existing bungalow, which is situated within a stretch of ribbon development that backs onto open countryside. The property is currently vacant and it is evident that it requires repair and refurbishment. It has been extended previously with a number of ground and first floor additions at the rear. These previous additions are of no architectural merit and although they are not clearly visible from the public domain, they have a negative effect on the appearance of the dwelling. I also observed during my site visit that a number of properties along this stretch of Hay Street have been altered and extended. These include the neighbouring properties on either side at numbers 6 and 8 Hay Street.
4. The proposal would involve extensive works, as described in the heading above. These would include increasing the roof height of the property and constructing a large rear extension that would cover the full width of the property. Two dormers would also be added on the front facing elevation. I also noted during my site visit that there are dormers on other properties

- nearby and, in that regard, the principle of constructing these features would be acceptable.
5. However, overall the bulk and mass of the extensions, would appear out of scale and harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and its immediate surroundings.
 6. Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 (DP) seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the design of new development is of high quality and should respect or improve the character of the site and surrounding area. This is reflected in Policy 2 of the Braughing Area Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Policy HOU11 of the DP also requires extensions to appear as a subservient addition to the existing building.
 7. Whilst I agree that a degree of modernisation and remodelling would enhance the appearance of the property and improve the living conditions for future occupants, I consider the overall scale to be excessive and unacceptably harmful to the dwelling and its immediate surroundings. In addition, although the crown roof would not be highly visible in the streetscene, it would not be sympathetic to the character or appearance of the dwelling. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the relevant policies of the DP and the NP, as referred to above.

Living Conditions

8. The Council contends that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants of numbers 6 and 8 Hay Street in terms of their outlook, natural light and privacy. Policy DES4 of the DP states that development proposals should avoid significant detrimental impacts on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
9. Although the proposed extensions would be inset from the two shared side boundaries, the proposal, when viewed from both neighbouring dwellings and their gardens, would be overly dominant and oppressive. This would be particularly the case in relation to number 8 Hay Street. Furthermore, the proposed full width floor to ceiling windows on the rear elevation would present a strong perception of being overlooked, which would make the rear gardens of the neighbouring dwellings less enjoyable places in which to be. This concern would also apply to the raised patio at the rear, which would also be at higher level.
10. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwellings. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policy DES4 of the DP.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR