
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 30 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/25/3375875

88 Havers Lane, Bishop's Stortford, Hertfordshire CM23 3PD

- 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 Jamie Foster and Emma Foster-Snooks against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/25/1486/HH, dated 15 September 2025, was refused on 6 November 2025.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side extension, ground floor rear extension, garage conversion and fenestration alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission is granted for a first-floor side extension, ground floor rear extension, garage conversion and fenestration alterations at 88 Havers Lane, Bishop's Stortford, Hertfordshire CM23 3PD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/25/1486/HH, dated 15 September 2025, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the first-floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for the erection of a first-floor side extension, single storey rear extension, conversion of the attached garage to habitable space and various changes to the fenestration at No 88, a detached house on the northern side of Havers Lane. There is no objection to the latter three of these, so the dispute and this appeal relate solely to the first-floor side extension. This would be above the converted flat roof garage and would provide further bedroom accommodation. Built alongside the next-door property No 90, with no overlooking side facing windows, and the outlook from No 90 being unaffected, the first-floor extension would not adversely affect the living conditions of adjacent occupiers.
4. The Council's objection relates to the visual impact of the first-floor extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. This section of Havers Lane is lined by two-storey detached and a few semi-detached houses set back behind front gardens. There is some variation in house types but tiled pitched roofs are a consistent feature, either hipped or, as in the case of No 88, almost pyramidal in form with a wide front facing gable above bay windows.
5. The first-floor side extension above the garage would be set back from the front elevation by about 0.7 m with the ridge about 1.1 m below that of the original

dwelling, in both respects an improvement on a previous refused design which had no set back and a small section of flat 'crown' roof, a poor design feature¹. The extension would not be as wide as the garage below, setting it in further from the common boundary with the next-door property No 90, again reducing its impact. Thus, when No 88 is viewed directly from the front, the first-floor extension would appear suitably subservient to the original dwelling and not out of place.

6. The Council's primary objection is to the roof form resulting from the 8.1 m depth of the extension. This depth necessitates an unusual double pitched roof which when seen from the side would have a wide M shape with the middle valley higher than the main eaves. This would appear slightly odd and visually unfortunate in the street scene but would only be seen obliquely from the road for a few metres when walking past.
7. However, several other properties on the northern side of Havers Lane have remodelled roof forms to facilitate side and rear extensions and conversions of the roofspace. These include No 68, with a first-floor side extension to the rear, Nos 78/80, semi-detached properties with large extensions removing the hipped roof and No 92, with a large side extension and roof hipped at just one end. Most comparable is No 84, just two doors away and until recently very similar to No 88, which now has a deep first floor side extension above the garage albeit with a more straightforward roof².
8. For a passer-by closely observing the roofscape this variety and the numerous extensions are readily apparent. Whilst the double roof on the side of No 88 would be slightly odd and visually unfortunate it would only be seen for a few metres and thus would not appear unduly prominent or jarring in the street scene.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons the first-floor side extension would not significantly affect the character and appearance of the host property or the street scene. It would therefore comply with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 and Policy HDP2 of the relevant Neighbourhood Plan³. These require extensions to be of a high design standard to reflect local distinctiveness, to be of a size, scale, form and design that are appropriate to the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area, and to appear as a subservient addition.
10. Three conditions are necessary. In addition to the standard implementation time limit it is necessary to define the approved plans in the interests of certainty and to require matching materials to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the street scene.
11. Having regard to the above the appeal should be allowed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR

¹ Application 3/25/1031/HH

² The delegated officer report states that No 84 is of matching design to No 88 but this is no longer the case.

³ Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and Part of Thorley

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location Plan
 - Proposed Site Block Plan
 - Block Plan
 - Existing Plans and Elevations Drawing no. NHP25985/01
 - Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing no. NHP25985/02
 - Street Scenes Drawing no. NHP25985/03
- 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.