



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2024

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/24/3350241

60 The Wick, Hertford, SG14 3HR

- 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 Karl Graham against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/24/1138/HH.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension. Single storey front extension. Relocation of first floor rear balcony. Insertion of 4 rooflight windows. Addition of pitched roof to front of house. New first floor side window and alterations to fenestration.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension, single storey front extension, relocation of first floor rear balcony, insertion of 4 rooflight windows, addition of pitched roof to front of house, new first floor side window and alterations to fenestration at 60 The Wick, Hertford, SG14 3HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/24/1138/HH, 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: 337-01, 337-02, 337-03A, 337-04A, 337-05A, 337-06B, 337-07B, 337-08B.
 - 3) Prior to the commencement of any above ground construction works, the external materials for the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reasons

2. The appeal dwelling is a 1960's-built detached two storey house located within an estate of dwellings built in the same period. It is one of four similar dwellings within this part of the road that were built to a similar style with a staggered siting. Like others in the area, some have been extended or altered over the years resulting in some variation but each one has a main gabled front elevation and a consistency in external materials that contributes to the character of the area. The appeal dwelling and its neighbour at no 62 each have a pitched roof two storey side extension set back from the front elevation.

At the appeal dwelling, there is also a first floor balcony across some two thirds of the rear elevation.

3. The rear elevation of the appeal dwelling is set back significantly from no 62 with the long flank wall of that dwelling alongside the side boundary. The rear elevation is set forward of the property on the other side at no 58. The proposed rear extension would maintain this staggered siting and would remain set back from no 62.
4. As it would have a hipped roof that would sit well below the height of the main ridge and the two storey part would not occupy the whole of the rear elevation, it would be sufficiently subservient in size and scale to the main part of the dwelling.
5. A flat roofed rear element would project beyond that with a balcony above together with a screen and a green wall for privacy. A further element with a lean-to roof would sit to the side of the two storey extension adjacent to the boundary with no 58. However, those elements would be subservient to both the two storey extension and to the dwelling as a whole.
6. Whilst the proposed rear extension would add a sizeable volume to the dwelling, it would not be clearly seen if at all from the street and the hipped roof would reduce its bulk and massing to an acceptable degree when seen from the rear of the site and from the rear of the neighbouring properties. The proposal would retain a good sized area of rear garden and given my findings in regards to size, scale, mass and bulk, it would not result in overdevelopment of the site.
7. The Council has raised no objection to the front extensions and alterations or the window alterations and as those would be compatible with the extensions and alterations at the neighbouring dwellings, those are also acceptable.
8. I conclude then that this is a carefully designed proposal that would not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the area. It accords, therefore, with development plan policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan (2018) which together require that extensions should be of a high standard of design and should generally appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling.

Other matters

9. Whilst the Council has not objected to the proposal in terms of its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, I have had careful regard to the representations made to the planning application.
10. I agree with the Council that the proposed screen and green wall would provide sufficient screening of no 62 from the proposed balcony which is not a new element and there is already some overlooking of no 58 from the existing balcony as acknowledged by the Council. As the new balcony would be positioned further in to the garden of the appeal site than the existing, any overlooking would be of the lower part of the garden of no 58 rather than across its patio area as at present and this would be an improvement in terms of privacy.
11. Given the 2.5m distance of the two-storey extension from the side boundary with no 58 and the limited height of the single storey extension, there would

not be any significant impact in terms of light or outlook to that property either.

12. I conclude then that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers and would accord with development plan policy HOU11 that also seeks to ensure that proposals do not significantly affect the amenity of neighbours.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition is also necessary for the approval of external materials as the application does not provide full details of those and in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector