



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/22/3299078

The Winnatts, Kents Lane, Standon SG11 1PJ

- 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 S Stay against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/22/0129/HH, dated 20 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey rear extension at The Winnatts, Kents Lane, Standon SG11 1PJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/22/0129/HH, dated 20 January 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: 20230-P001-A and 20230-S001-1st
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those specified on the application form.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with accommodation within the roofspace. From the road, the property appears a modest sized bungalow with 2 small dormer windows and a rooflight within the front roofslope. However, within the rear roofslope there is a full width dormer with a flat roof which gives the impression of a 2-storey dwelling.
4. Planning permission was granted by the Council for a 2-storey rear addition to the property which included a first floor element where the rear elevation would be set back from the ground floor rear elevation (Ref 3/20/0356/HH). The full details of this approved scheme have not been provided but the

principle of a rear addition to the property is given significant weight in the determination of this appeal as a fallback position.

5. A larger 2-storey rear extension is proposed. The main difference identified between the approved and appeal schemes is that there would not be a set back at first floor level. There would only be a modest increase in the depth of the first floor of the extension by around 2.2 metres. Although the comments of the Planning Officer are noted, it does not appear from the evidence available that the ridge height of the approved and appeal schemes would be materially different.
6. By reason of siting to the rear of the property, the proposed extension would not be readily visible from the public realm. As with the approved scheme, there would be the ability to see part of the side elevation of the proposed extension from Kents Lane but this would neither be conspicuous nor highly visible from the road. There would be views from the neighbouring dwellings but these would be predominantly views of the appeal scheme set against the context of the property.
7. The proposed development would break-up the horizontal form of the rear dormer and its scale would not represent an overdevelopment of the curtilage. From what could be observed during the site visit, other dwellings fronting Kents Lane have similar footprints and plot coverage comparable to the enlarged appeal property.
8. The scale and massing of the proposed extension is such that it would not appear as being a subservient addition to the host property. However, the general scale of the proposed development is similar to the approved scheme, which is a fallback position capable of being implemented. As already noted, the main difference would be confined to a modest increase in the depth of the proposed extension at first floor level. Accordingly, there would not be such a material difference between the approved and appeal schemes so as to amount to a sufficient reason for this appeal to fail due to adverse harm being caused to the character and appearance of the host property by reason of a lack of subserviency.
9. For these reasons the proposed scheme would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding predominantly residential area. There would not be conflict with Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan (DP) and Policy SP 13 of the Standon Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (NP) concerning development respecting, and being appropriate to, the character of the site, the surrounding area and the residential environment of Standon.
10. The Council has not objected to the appeal scheme by reason of any significant harm being caused to the setting of the Standon Conservation Area and there are no reasons to adopt a different assessment. The appellant has provided examples of extensions to other dwellings within the wider area but this appeal has been assessed on its own circumstances.
11. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with DP Policies HOU11 and DES4 and NP Policy SP 13. No conflict has been identified with DP Policy VILL1 because of the varying character of the village.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of clarity, a condition is necessary to secure the erection of the proposed extension in accordance with the approved drawings. To assist with the assimilation of the appeal scheme into the surrounding area a condition for the external materials to be those specified on the application form is necessary.
13. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR