



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/22/3300368

17 Oakroyd Close, Potters Bar EN6 2EW

- 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 Dawn Hanson against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/2423/HSE, dated 17 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion to habitable room with rear dormer and balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion to habitable room with rear dormer and balcony at 17 Oakroyd Close, Potters Bar EN6 2EW in accordance with the terms of the application, 21/2423/HSE, dated 17 December 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is a more succinct and accurate description of the development before me than that provided in part 4 of the planning application form. I have, however, amended the description to omit 'retrospective application' and reference to amended plans and a 'correction to description.'
3. I saw on my site visit that the rear dormer and balcony have been constructed and the planning application was made retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the rear dormer and balcony on the character and appearance of the host bungalow and Royds Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. No.17 Oakroyd Close (No.17) is a detached bungalow located at the end of an offshoot of Oakroyd Close, a residential cul-de-sac. It is located within the Royds Estate Conservation Area (CA).
6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The Royds

Estate CA includes the long cul-de-sacs (and their offshoots) of Oakroyd Close and Elmroyd Avenue and a section of Baker Street. The significance of the CA is, in part, derived from the architectural quality and coherence of the inter-war style housing originally constructed by builder, Edward Hicks.

7. No.17 was originally built as a detached two-bedroom bungalow, categorised as 'House Type C.' However, it was significantly extended in the 1990s to the rear and side incorporating a car port and dormer in the front roofslope. Although not in its original form or proportions, the front elevation retains the pyramidal pitched roof and projecting gable with bay window that is characteristic of the Edward Hicks design. It does therefore make a positive contribution to the CA.
8. To the rear, No.17 has three projecting gables (of different depths) and a flat roof box dormer with glazed doors and small balcony has been constructed within the main roof slope between two of the gables. The guidance in the *Planning and Design Guide Part E: Guidelines for Residential Extensions and Alterations* (2006) is that dormers should generally be located within the rear roof slope and '*as a general rule, the Council will resist dormers that take up more than 60% of the roof face.*' The dormer is consistent with this guidance, covering around 58.8%. The dormer is around 5.6m in width with a height of around 2.4m, but has been designed so that it is set down from the ridge of the original roof and up from the eaves. Because of this, despite the scale of the dormer, it is still possible to appreciate the original pyramid roof of the bungalow and it appears a proportionate addition, subordinate to the gables.
9. Further, the dormer is sympathetically located between two of the rear facing gables which hides the dormer cheeks reducing any perception of the depth or bulk of the dormer. The small balcony has been enclosed with narrow metal railings which do not particularly add to the scale or mass of the dormer and there remains an attractive composition and design quality to the rear elevation. I do not therefore find the development to cause harm to the architectural characteristics of the original design of the bungalow, which I note was also the conclusion of the Council's Conservation Officer.
10. Whilst it may be possible to see the dormer and balcony from the very rear of the gardens of neighbouring dwellings, views would be very limited and neither can be seen from the public realm of Oakroyd Close. I observed on site that there are also no views of the rear of No.17 from the permissive footpath that runs along the southern boundary because of the high boundary wall (over 6ft) and the farmland hedging. The dormer, including the full height glazed doors and balcony, would not therefore appear highly incongruous or cause harm to local character.
11. On the main issue, I conclude that the development would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the host bungalow or the CA. Consequently, there would be no conflict with policies CS14 and CS22 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy (2013) or policies SADM29 and SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) which together require all development to be of high quality design that improves the character and quality of an area and conserves the Borough's historic environment. There would also be no conflict with the guidance at Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested a condition that the development permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Since the development has already been constructed, I do not consider this is necessary and no conditions are therefore imposed.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR