



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/25/3370889

93 St Margarets Road, Stanstead Abbots SG12 8ER

- 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 Richard Scola against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application Ref. is 3/25/0500/HH.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for two-storey side and rear extensions at 93 St Margarets Road, Stanstead Abbots SG12 8ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 3/25/0500/HH and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. GAL 393 (PC) 001 & GAL 393 (PC) 002.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene of St Margarets Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached dwelling with No. 95 to the east and has a garage that fills in the gap at ground floor level to the flank boundary of No. 91. The appeal scheme proposes a side two-storey extension that would again extend very close to the boundary but with a frontage gabled roof that would follow the same pitch as the main roof of the dwelling, thereby leaving a V-shaped gap above the eaves to No. 91.
4. No. 91 has already been extended to the shared boundary, but although the roof is lower than that of the original dwelling to achieve appropriate subservience, the extended front elevation is somewhat featureless. There is the door of the integral

garage and other than a bedroom window this extension features a large area of roughcast rendered wall.

5. The existing frontage of the appeal dwelling with the attached garage and the glazed porch with a mono-pitched tiled roof is somewhat dated and lacks any visual merit. However, the appeal scheme with its main gable, smaller gabled new porch linked by a horizontal roof element to the bay window, and the front elevation's revamped fenestration with a matching design style for all the windows, would in my view be a significant improvement to the appearance of the dwelling.
6. As such, it would contribute positively to this part of the street scene and outweigh any harm caused by the increased terracing effect with No. 91. I use the term 'any harm' advisedly. This is on the basis that with a number of approvals of similar applications under the flexibility allowed by Policy HOU11(b) of the East Herts District Local Plan 2018, the Council now appears, in part at least, to accept that the terracing effect arising from frontage infill extensions is now part and parcel of the established street scene of St Margarets Road.
7. The appellant's thorough research for the application and this appeal includes officer comments supportive of this view to justify approval of similar schemes in St Margarets Road. In addition, there are the statistics – since the adoption of the District Local Plan seven of the eight applications for first floor side extensions built to the boundary have been approved. And when the more historic extensions are taken into account 74% of the houses have similar side extensions and of these almost nine out of ten have been built to the boundary.
8. At my visit to the appeal property, I travelled along the full length of St Margarets Road and have no reason to doubt the accuracy of this information. There may well be other cases in the future where there are reasons why these precedents do not prevail in the decision-making process. However, in this instance I consider that with the noticeable improvement both to the appearance of No. 93 and this section of the road that would result from the proposed development, the appeal deserves to succeed. Accordingly, I find that there would be no harmful conflict with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the District Plan or with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
9. The appeal is therefore allowed. A condition requiring matching external materials will secure a harmonious development that preserves visual amenity. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR