



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X1925/D/22/3304621

3 Masefield Way, Royston, Hertfordshire SG8 5UU

- 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 Wilson against the decision of North Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01609/FPH, dated 13 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The North Hertfordshire District Local Plan (LP) was adopted and, as such, reference is made in this appeal decision to the most up-to-date policies which were emerging at the time the application was determined. A split decision was issued by the Council and this appeal is only concerned with the proposed rear dormer.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposed development includes the erection of an extension within the rear roofslope of a 2-storey detached dwelling situated within a predominantly residential area of similar types of dwellings. The proposed development seeks to enable the appellant to utilise the roofspace as additional residential accommodation.
5. Within the wider area there are examples of 3-storey buildings. Based upon what could be observed, there are also some properties with small dormers with gable roofs within their front roofslopes. However, because of they are sited a distance away from the appeal property these other schemes do not provide the local context for the proposed development.
6. By reason of its size and form, rather than being a sympathetic addition the proposed flat roof rear dormer extension would visually and physically dominate the rear roofslope of the property and give the impression of a third

storey being added. The appeal scheme would be an incongruous addition to the property and would fail to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding 2-storey dwellings. This unacceptable harm would be noticeable from surrounding gardens and from Betjeman Road above the boundary wall of 1 Masefield Way rather than from this road itself. The unacceptable massing and design of the proposed rear roof extension would not be satisfactorily mitigated by the windows nor the use of hanging tiles as the external material.

7. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies D1 and D2. Amongst other matters, these policies require proposals to respond positively to local context and for dwelling extensions to be sympathetic to the existing house in form, roof type and proportions. Accordingly, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR