
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K1935/D/23/3325427
23 Park View, Stevenage, Herts SG2 8PU

- 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 Anthony Hawkins against the decision of Stevenage Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00323/FPH, dated 24 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side extension at 23 Park View, Stevenage, Herts SG2 8PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00323/FPH, dated 24 April 2023, 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: Site Location Plan; BD/21/2/1; BD/21/2/2B; BD/21/2/3A.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey house, described as 'linked detached', which is located within a residential area containing a variety of houses, all appearing to date from the same era. No 23 Park View sits at the junction of 2 sections of Park View.
4. The proposed extension would provide accommodation over 2 floors. The extension would be 4m wide and the same depth as the existing house, save

for a small set-back at the front. The roof over the extension would have sloping sections at the front and rear and a large flat section, resulting in a crown roof. The appellant has drawn my attention to an extant planning permission for a similar extension at the property (Ref, 21/00607/FPH, granted in June 2021). The only difference being that the approved extension would be 3m in width.

5. The existing side area at No 23 is generous and is said to measure around 8.3m. The proposed extension would mean that the new building would reduce the gap to around 4.3m. The Council objects to the reduction in the gap here and compares it to No 11 on the opposite side of that section of Park View. No 11 has a different orientation and faces onto this section of the road and is around 5m from the boundary. I judge that such a marginal difference would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The Council also refer to the difference in distance from the boundary compared to No 22, to the rear of the appeal site. This house is sited some distance from the building at No 23 and so the fact that the proposed extension would be closer to the road would not, in itself, appear out of place. Furthermore, having observed the wider area, there are no consistent building lines and numerous buildings are set closer to their boundaries than the proposal would be. Within this context, I see nothing harmful arising from the extensions proximity to the boundary.
7. The Council also refer to the alleged unacceptable appearance of the proposed crown roof. However, I note that the same design was approved for the extant planning permission; the only difference being its width. In my judgement, the proposed roof design for the appeal scheme would be so similar to that of the approved scheme that its effects on the surrounding area would be the same.
8. Overall, I consider that the proposal would not unacceptably reduce the space around it and would not result in a building which appears too close to the plot boundary, within the local context. Its effects on the surrounding area would be very similar to those of the scheme approved by the Council and in relation to the design of the roof in particular, would have an almost identical effect. Therefore, I find that the proposal would not harm the locality and would not conflict with Policies GD1 and SP8 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011-2021, nor with the Councils Stevenage Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
9. In relation to conditions, the Council has indicated that in the event that the appeal is allowed, conditions relating to the timing of the commencement of development, materials and conformity with the approved plans would be necessary. So that the development would have a satisfactory appearance and for the sake of certainty, I agree that these conditions are necessary. The Council suggested no other conditions and I have no material before me that indicates any more are necessary.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR