



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2023

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/23/3319414
17 Chadwell, Ware SG12 9JY

- 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 & Mrs Kendall against the decision of East Herts District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/22/2544/HH, dated 7 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2023.
 - The proposed development is first floor rear extension, existing pitched dormer extended.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The Council has described the development as "First floor rear / side extension with rear flat roof dormer extended sideways; pitched roof front dormer extended forward and cropped hip side roof reformed as gable end". This more accurately describes the whole development.
2. I have also been referred to a recent decision of the Council relating to the "removal of rear dormer; proposed first floor rear flat roof dormer extension; pitched roof front dormer extended forward; cropped side roof reformed as gable end" at the appeal property¹. This was approved after this appeal was lodged and being a similar scheme to that before me is a material consideration which I have taken into account.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor rear / side extension with rear flat roof dormer extended sideways; pitched roof front dormer extended forward and cropped hip side roof reformed as gable end at 17 Chadwell, Ware SG12 9JY in accordance with the terms of application ref: 3/22/2544/HH dated 7 December 2022 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 14481-S001-1st (Existing: plans & elevations) and 14481-P003-A (Proposals).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

¹ Application ref: 3/23/0342/HH

Main Issue

4. The Council does not object to the alteration to the reformed gable end therefore the main issue is the impact of the front and rear dormer alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

5. The dwelling on the appeal site is a large detached two storey property set on land that slopes up from the road. It has traditional features including round bay windows and forward projecting gable with central front door entrance accessed via steps from the landscaped front garden. There is an attached garage to the side with steep pitched roof above providing first floor accommodation served by a centrally positioned, pitched roof dormer to the front and small flat roofed rear addition.
6. The wider street scene comprises a mixture of older, more traditional properties such as on the appeal site, predominantly detached but with some semi-detached, as well as more modern properties. The properties are located on one side of the road only with a well vegetated embankment between them and the main Hertford Road to the north, which runs parallel to Chadwell. There are a number of mature trees within this area giving the road a pleasant 'green' character.
7. The proposal would involve the enlargement of the existing front dormer extending it forward so that it would be set close to the front edge of the garage roof, just behind the eaves. The additional bulk would be visible in the street scene being set close to the front roof edge, but the extended dormer would remain proportionate in size relative to the roofslope and would not dominate the existing roof form. In views approaching from the west along Chadwell, the dormer would appear noticeably larger but, given the set back of the property from the road frontage and that the dormer would not extend forward of the main front gable of the existing dwelling against which it would be read, it would not appear as a dominant or intrusive addition. Overall, it would be a sympathetic addition in terms of scale and design.
8. The rear addition would not be readily seen within the street scene of Chadwell, with only the side elevation of the addition being visible above the flank elevation of the existing garage which is set forward relative to the adjoining property. Notwithstanding this due to its relatively small scale when seen against the backdrop of the main dwelling, it would be seen as a modest addition in this glimpsed view.
9. In design terms, it would result in a much larger, rear flat roofed addition to a property which has predominantly pitched roofs. In addition, it would occupy virtually the whole of the roofslope resulting in a somewhat over-scaled addition. However, there are a number of examples of similar rear additions to nearby properties, notably the property next door but one to the appeal site, which can be seen in views from Chadwell Rise to the west. However, the proposed dormer would be more discretely located at first floor rather than roof level and would not be visible from this nearby street. Overall, I do not consider that it would be out of keeping or unsympathetic in this context.
10. I note that the recent approval allowed for smaller additions than that now proposed, with the front dormer maintaining a set back from the roof edge and

the existing small rear addition removed and replaced with a more centrally located flat roofed dormer retaining more of the existing roofslope. However, for the reasons set out above, the slightly larger additions in the appeal scheme before me would not be so different as to render them unacceptable.

11. I therefore find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would thereby accord with Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan (2018) which seek, amongst other things, a high standard of design and layout to reflect and promote local distinctiveness and to ensure that extensions and alterations to dwellings are of a size, scale, mass, form, siting and design that are appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and be generally subservient in appearance. Dormers should be appropriate to the design and character of the dwelling and its surroundings and generally of limited extent and modest proportions so as to not dominate the existing roof form.

Conclusions

12. Conditions to ensure that the development is built in accordance with the approved plans and uses matching materials are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.
13. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR