



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J1595/D/22/3299209

47 Cambridge Road, Sawbridgeworth CM21 9JP

- 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 Steve Caudle against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application Ref 3/22/0171/HH, dated 24 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 25th March 2022.
 - The proposed development is to replace three single roof dormers with a new singular crown roof dormer to the front elevation, replace five single roof dormers with a new singular crown roof dormer to the rear elevation, a new crown roof dormer to the north facing elevation roof and three no. rooflights to the south elevation roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies in a residential 'backland' location to the rear of properties fronting Cambridge Road, accessed via a narrow drive between nos. 45 and 49. The main part of the site is rectangular in shape with the existing dwelling, an L shaped chalet bungalow, sited towards the side (south) and rear (west) boundaries. The dwelling has a pitched tiled roof with individual dormers and rooflights. The main garden area lies to the front of the dwelling in the northern part of the site.
4. The proposed long single crown roof dormers would be set within the existing pitched roof, replacing the existing pitched roof dormers on both roofslopes of the west 'wing' and providing a new single dormer on the north facing roofslope of the south 'wing'. Policy HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan (2018) (DP) states that roof dormers may be acceptable if appropriate to the design and character of the dwelling and surroundings and should generally be of limited extent and modest proportions so as to not dominate the existing roof form.
5. In contrast to the above, the proposed dormers are large additions, extending across almost the whole width of the roofslopes on which they are proposed. In addition, they would occupy almost the whole depth of the roofslopes. As such they would be overly dominant additions. Furthermore, the overly large scale and crown roof design of the dormers would fail to reflect the simple

pitched roof form of the existing dwelling, resulting in a 'top heavy' appearance.

6. Whilst the dwelling is not readily visible from the main road, the proposed dormers would nevertheless fail to be sympathetic to the design and appearance of the host dwelling. It is noted that the roof of the dwelling can be seen from the car park of the football club to the rear of the site, albeit there is some existing screening that limits the view.
7. I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It would thereby conflict with DP Policy HOU11 and Policy DES4 which seek a high standard of design and layout that promotes local distinctiveness, and seeks to ensure that extensions are of a size and scale that are appropriate to the character of the dwelling and surrounding area and generally appear as a subservient addition.
8. With regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, I find that the proposal would fail to contribute to achieving well designed places nor would it result in the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings.

Other Matters

9. The Appellant suggests that the single large roof dormers are necessary to achieve adequate head height within the existing first floor bedrooms and bathrooms. However, it appears to me that whilst they would allow for larger usable areas, they are not essential to achieve reasonable room sizes given the existing arrangement whereby the first floor rooms are served by individual pitched roof dormers. The harm identified is not outweighed by this consideration.

Conclusions

10. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR