
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2023

by **Steven Hartley BA(Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS, MRTPI, MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/22/3308613

6 Presdales Drive, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12 9NS

- 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 Chris Jones against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application, Ref 3/22/0979/HH dated 10 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the removal of a conservatory and one chimney, a new two storey rear extension to include a first floor Juliet balcony, and single storey side extension with side facing rooflights, an altered roof to the front porch, and a new rear facing rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the removal of a conservatory and one chimney, a new two storey rear extension to include a first floor Juliet balcony, and a single storey side extension with side facing rooflights, an altered roof to the front porch, and a new rear facing rooflight at 6 Presdales Drive, Ware, Hertfordshire, SG12 9NS in accordance with the terms of the application ref 3/22/0979/HH dated 10 May 2022, subject to the following conditions: -
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan(received by the LPA on 10 May 2022);285-05 Rev B; 285-06 Rev B, 285-07 Rev B; 285-08 Rev B and 285-09 Rev B.
 - iii. 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon (i) the character and appearance of the area and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4 Presdales Drive by reason of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 6 Presdales Drive is a detached, two storey dwelling in a residential area. It has detached bungalows to either side and all of which are located upon a sloping site and a bend in the road and with front and rear amenity spaces.
4. The proposed development includes a two storey extension along the full width of the rear elevation, and which joins a single storey, flat roofed side extension to the rear of the existing single storey garage where it is proposed to use the latter for other domestic purposes and to reconfigure it with a mono pitch roof. The proposal also includes a redesigned single storey front porch with a monopitch roof.
5. The proposed two storey rear extension would project from the existing dwelling by some 4.5 metres with a width of approximately 6.0 metres. While it would be a substantial addition to the bulk of the existing property, it would not exceed the ridge of the existing dwelling and its overall scale and mass, taking into account its design and location to the rear of the property, would not appear as a disproportionate addition, contrary to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The reconfigured garage would have a monopitch roof, while to the rear of it would be a single storey flat roofed side extension. The resulting roof forms would be visually complex, but due to their limited widths and their single storey height, they would not create a significant or incongruous appearance when seen from the front or side of the dwelling.
7. The proposed porch would have a monopitch roof stretching to the first floor windowsill above it and with a pitch comparable to that of the main house. By its limited size and proposed pitch, it would be appropriate to the overall character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development as a whole would accord with policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 (DP) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) which require a high standard of design and where extensions and alterations to dwellings relate well to their character and appearance and that of the surrounding area.

Outlook

9. No 4 Presdales Drive adjoins the appeal property and is at a lower level. It includes 4 windows to habitable rooms which face the proposed development, though they are sited behind a closely located wooden boundary fence which is as high as the windows.
10. The proposed alterations to the existing garage to the host property would not extend its footprint any closer towards No 4 Presdales Drive. It would result in the replacement of its existing double pitch roof with a cat slide roof which would have a greater maximum height. However, the proposed cat slide roof would have a lower height than the existing roof at the point facing the common boundary, from which it would angle upwards and away from its lowest point and towards the host property. Overall, the difference in term of

outlook for the occupants of No 4 Presdales Drive would not be significantly different.

11. To the rear of the existing garage is a proposed flat roofed extension to the side of the host property. Its siting would be at a point where the site boundary angles away from it. By its limited width, its single storey height and the angling away from No 4 Presdales Drive, it would not have a significantly adverse impact upon the occupiers of No 4 Presdales Drive, whom I note have not objected to the proposed development.
12. In its officer report, the local planning authority considers that the two storey rear extension, because it is angled away from No 4 Presdales Drive, would result in an acceptable impact upon the occupiers of the latter property, while the proposed porch would be sufficiently separated from the adjoining property to have an acceptable impact. I have no reason to disagree.
13. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would conform with DP policy DES4 which requires development to avoid significant detrimental impacts upon the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, and with paragraph 130(f) of chapter 12 of the Framework which promotes a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conditions

14. I have imposed the standard time condition as well as a condition relating to the approved plans for certainty.
15. I have imposed a condition relating to external materials in the interests of good design.

Conclusion

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

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR