



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X1925/D/24/3355468

68 Chiltern Road, Baldock, Hertfordshire SG7 6LS

- 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 Laura Leeson against the decision of North Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01489/FPH.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'demolition of existing detached garage. Single storey side and rear extensions, with deep retrofit improvements to the existing building fabric, with flat roof and two rooflights. New front entrance porch with flat roof. Hip to gable loft extension and rear dormer loft extension. Insertion of 3 rooflights to front roof pitch. Reduction in width of window to first floor bathroom. Insertion of black brick coursing to gable wall junction with flank wall at eaves level. Construction of steps to enable access to ground level from extension floor level'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing detached garage. Single storey side and rear extensions, with deep retrofit improvements to the existing building fabric, with flat roof and two rooflights. New front entrance porch with flat roof. Hip to gable loft extension and rear dormer loft extension. Insertion of 3 rooflights to front roof pitch. Reduction in width of window to first floor bathroom. Insertion of black brick coursing to gable wall junction with flank wall at eaves level. Construction of steps to enable access to ground level from extension floor level at 68 Chiltern Road, Baldock, Hertfordshire, SG7 6LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01489/FPH, 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: 001 (Location Plan), PL.001A (Proposed Layouts), PL.002A (Proposed Elevations 1 of 2) and PL.003A (Proposed Elevations 2 of 2).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan nos. PL.002A (Proposed Elevations 1 of 2) and PL.003A (Proposed Elevations 2 of 2).

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I observed on my site visit that some building works have already commenced at the appeal site. However, from what I observed I cannot be certain that the works being undertaken are connected with the appeal proposal or an alternative development. Nevertheless, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings for the development described.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 68 Chiltern Road (No 68) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated within a residential area. Chiltern Road has some consistencies in that the dwellings are two-storey, semi-detached and are mostly set within a consistent building line. However, there are some variances in the appearance of the dwellings. They feature both hipped or gable roofs, render and brick elevations, and some have been extended. Porches vary in scale and while they mostly have pitched roofs, there are mono pitched, hipped and gable fronted examples, as well as some flat roof canopies. Consequently, the street scene does not have an entirely uniform appearance. Indeed, due to the gable roof extension, dormer windows and large front porch at the adjoining dwelling at 66 Chiltern Road (No 66), No 68 and No 66 are noticeably unbalanced in the street scene.
6. The appeal proposal would be of a contemporary form and appearance utilising materials which would contrast with the existing pale render of the original dwelling. The front porch would be of a modest scale, as a result a flat roof would not look out of place or overly prominent. The proposed light-coloured ice grey cladding of the porch and the side extension would be sympathetic to the colour of the rendered dwellings nearby and would not look out place where there are a variety of pale shades of render within this section of the road. Although the flat roof form and the timber cladding of the porch would differentiate it from others in the street scene, it would nevertheless appear as a high quality and attractive addition to the host dwelling. It would not unacceptably alter the character and appearance of the street scene, where the original bay window of the property would remain.
7. At the rear of the property, the single storey extension and dormer window would also incorporate a contemporary form and appearance, albeit with black cladding rather than grey. The use of black cladding would be striking, however, the rear gardens on Chiltern Road are of a generous size and the dormer window would be mostly seen in longer views from neighbouring properties or the garage court to the rear of the property. In the context of the appeal property and surrounding development, the rear extension would not be a dominant feature on the rear of the property. In these circumstances, despite their contemporary design and darker coloured cladding, the dormer window and the single storey extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, nor would it unacceptably unbalance the pair of dwellings.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the North

Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 (2022), which amongst other matters require that development proposals respond positively to the site's local context, are sympathetic to the existing house and do not dominate adjoining properties.

9. For the same reasons, the proposal would comply with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions. I have included the standard time limit condition and plans condition in the interests of certainty and clarity. Although the Council did not request it, a materials condition is also necessary so that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the area. The requirements of the condition should not come as a surprised to either party.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed development would comply with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no other material planning considerations which would alter this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR