
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2023

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/22/3302660

68 Mangrove Road, Hertford SG13 8AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gavin Halliday against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 3/22/0614/HH, dated 22 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing double hipped roof with double gable ended roof including raised ridge height with one rear dormer and four front rooflights to incorporate habitable loft space accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement of existing double hipped roof with double gable ended roof including raised ridge height with one rear dormer and four front rooflights to incorporate habitable loft space accommodation at 68 Mangrove Road, Hertford SG13 8AN in accordance with the terms of the application, and the plans submitted with it, 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 strict accordance with the following approved drawings: Location Plan; Block Plan; MR/21/1 Plans As Existing; MR/22/S3/4 Plans As Proposed - Scheme Three; MR/22/S3/5 Street Scene.
 - 3) 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 Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey house located opposite an area of green space, in a residential suburb. The house has brick walls and a hipped tile roof. The dwellings in the locality are predominantly twentieth century, two-storey houses. That said, some variation of building materials and form is noticeable due to the following combination of factors. The appeal house contributes

variety to the street scene in several ways. It is a detached house separated from neighbouring pairs of semis by a gap on each side. It has red brick walls, compared to various types of render that are more prevalent in the locality. Also, it has curved bay windows at the front, instead of more angular bays at the front of the neighbouring pair of semis to the north.

4. Moreover, some variety of hip and gable roof forms, and various porches, dormers and other extensions contribute to moderate architectural diversity in the vicinity of the appeal building. Also, there is some local variation in gaps between houses. This includes No 66 extending closer to the side boundary with No 68 than No 70. Verdant front gardens, and green space on the eastern side of Mangrove Road contribute to a soft landscape framework that provides further visual variety and softening of built elements. Also, different set-backs of houses from the pavement result in a stepped sequence of some front elevations on the southern approach to the appeal dwelling. Together, the above factors result in a host stretch of leafy residential suburb with a moderate variation of materials, built forms, and hard and soft elements.
5. Within this context, the proposed roof enlargement, and change from hip to gable roof would reduce the amount of space between the appeal dwelling and houses at each side including No 66, at roof level. However, that said, the main bodies of these buildings would noticeably continue to be separated by gaps, and No 68 would remain a detached house between pairs of semis. Moreover, No 68's proposed increased roof ridge height would appear similar to that of its neighbours, viewed from various points along Mangrove Road. As such, it is unlikely that the proposed enlarged roof would unduly draw the eye. Thus, the appeal house and its adjacent pairs of semis would not discordantly appear as a terraced row.
6. Moreover, the moderate local variety of spacing between buildings would endure. The more symmetrical appearance of the appeal dwelling's front elevation after the proposed development, compared to No 66, would further help to avoid uncharacteristic architectural uniformity. Matching external materials with those of the existing house would help the proposed development to assimilate into its setting. Also, the verdancy of front gardens and local green space would continue to help visually soften and integrate built elements, including the host row of houses. Thus, the locality's distinctive moderate suburban architectural variety would endure, and the proposed development would acceptably fit into the local street scene.
7. In conclusion, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan which together seek to ensure that development appropriately safeguards local character.

Conclusion

8. The proposed development would adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal succeeds.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR