



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2009

by **Simon Berkeley** BA MA MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
22 October 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/A/09/2110455

Elfering Bank, Hadham Ford, Ware, Hertfordshire SG11 2AY

- 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 Mrs Lindsey Dybell against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
- The application reference 3/08/2023/FP, dated 26 November 2008, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2009.
- The development proposed is extensions to existing bungalow and conversion of the enlarged roof space, and erection of cart lodge.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for extensions to existing bungalow and conversion of the enlarged roof space, and erection of cart lodge at Elfering Bank, Hadham Ford, Ware, Hertfordshire SG11 2AY in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 3/08/2023/FP, dated 26 November 2008, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the seven conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. Elfering Bank is a detached bungalow in the Hadham Ford Conservation Area. Marshalls and Stumbledon are the closest houses, and it lies to the rear of the latter, oriented roughly at right angles such that its side gable faces Stumbledon's rear elevation. Access to the site is from a driveway between the two neighbouring properties.
 4. Stumbledon, Marshalls and other properties nearby are of a traditional design, and many are of some vintage. Among these, in my view, the more recent style of the existing bungalow has a somewhat uninspiring appearance of little distinction and, in short, it makes no positive contribution to the conservation area.
 5. This scheme involves slightly lengthening the bungalow, raising its roof ridge by approximately 1.3 metres to create first floor accommodation, including three rear dormer windows and front roof lights. Projecting gable elements would be added to the front and rear elevations, to create a cruciform arrangement. The property's rendered elevations would be replaced by dark stained boarding.
-

6. The enlargement of the existing bungalow and height increase proposed, though not excessive, would make it more visible in the village scene, given its elevated position on an embankment. However, that alone should not render the proposal unacceptable. As I see it, the form of the resulting house would be more visually interesting than that of the current bungalow. Its composition, particularly the uniformity of the fenestration and the vertical emphasis of the glazing, would be more in keeping here, and the timber elevations would be similar to some of the older properties in the village. In this context, that people would be able to see the extended property more readily would not be a disadvantage.
7. In this part of the village, the sloping landform is a quite distinctive ingredient of the conservation area. On the whole, the rooftops of properties here rise up in parallel with it, mirroring its climb, particularly around Ford Hill nearby. Following this pattern, the height of the proposed roof ridge would be read in that topographical context. Although consequently of some visual prominence, it would not look out of place. On this point, I am mindful of the rather dense belt of tall trees along the bank, close to the appeal property. Many views of the resultant house would be against this backdrop, with the roof ridge below the skyline. In these surroundings, the development would not stand out to any material degree, and the wooden elevations would help to blend the house into the immediate scenery.
8. Given all this, I consider that the house formed by the proposed extensions would not be an excessively dominant component of the conservation area, despite its size. Notwithstanding the lower position and proximity of the neighbouring houses, it would not visually overwhelm them, or otherwise erode the contribution they make here. Whilst I acknowledge that Stumbledon is a Listed Building, the limited height increase proposed to the appeal property, along with the set back position of the projecting gable elements, would prevent any material impact on its setting, which would generally be preserved.
9. The Council has raised no objections to the proposed cart lodge. As it would be of a modest scale and built in materials to match the main property, I have no compelling reason to find to the contrary.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such, it would not conflict with the most relevant development plan policies, being Policies BH5 and BH6 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review. These permit extensions to unlisted buildings in a conservation area where they are sympathetic in terms of scale, height, proportion, form, materials and siting in relation to the building itself, adjacent buildings and the general character and appearance of the area, so long as important views within, into and out of the conservation area or its setting are respected.
11. Neither would it be contrary to Local Plan Policies ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6. These seek a high standard of design and layout reflecting local distinctiveness. They allow extensions in villages such as this provided that, among other things, the character and appearance of the dwelling and any adjoining dwellings would not be significantly affected to their detriment. Policy ENV6 says that extensions should be to a design and choice of materials either matching or complimentary to those of the original building and its setting, and accepts dormers appropriate in design that do not dominate the roof form.

Other matters

12. I note the other concerns raised about the effect on neighbours' living conditions, in terms of visual impact, privacy and light. However, as the position of the appeal property in relation to Stumbledon and Marshalls would not alter, any change in these respects would largely be brought about by the proposed increase in height. To my mind, though, this would be quite limited.
13. From both the interior and rear garden of Stumbledon, much of the existing facing gable is concealed by the change in land levels, an intervening outbuilding within the garden and a boundary wall. In my opinion, the slightly higher gable and chimney stack proposed would not have a significantly greater visual impact than that presently experienced. Neither this, nor views of the more distant projecting elements proposed, would be overbearing. Whilst more would be seen from upstairs windows, and the side driveway, the effect would not be an oppressive one. Even though most of Elfering Banks' raised roofline would be noticeable from Marshalls', particularly from the elevated portion of its rear garden, the distance involved is greater and the relationship less intimate. Because of this, the appeal scheme would not visually intrude on those areas to any significant extent.
14. No windows are proposed in the gable facing Stumbledon, and those in the proposed family room would be considerably set back beyond the ridge formed by the change in land levels. Most activities at Stumbledon would be hidden from there. The proposed front projecting gable would include windows at ground and first floor level. However, views towards Marshalls from the former would be impeded by the proposed cart lodge. In any event, any overlooking would not be at close quarters, and would be restricted, by and large, to more distant views of the rearmost portion of Marshall's rear garden. Whilst I note that there is a pergola structure and seating area there, this relationship would not be dissimilar to that commonly found in conventional housing layouts. The effect would not be a notably invasive one, and would be acceptable.
15. I note that concerns on these points have been raised in respect of other properties. But these are all more distant still. Because of this, in my opinion, the scheme would not cause problems of the kind feared.
16. Given the orientation of the properties, it seems to me that the levels of daylight and sunlight reaching Marshalls would not be reduced. Whilst I consider it likely that the additional roof height and front gable proposed would lessen sunlight to Stumbledon, this would be to a substantially limited degree, during the early morning hours. To my mind, the impact would not be significant, and would not cause material harm to the living conditions there. Despite these additions, I consider that the two properties would remain sufficiently separated to prevent any significant reduction in daylight.
17. It may be that Elfering Bank could be refurbished, as an alternative, and I note the point made that demolishing it should not be allowed. However, this appeal proposes neither of those things, but rather seeks to extend it, and I have determined it on its merits.

Conditions

18. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of advice in Circular 11/95. To make sure the development has a satisfactory appearance, I agree that the Council should approve samples of the materials to be used, and that a landscaping condition is needed. It is likely that development would involve excavating a small portion of the embankment, and removing material currently on the land. As such, it is necessary to require that the proposed finished levels or contours be approved, as should details of the planting proposed, to make sure the character or appearance of the conservation area is preserved or enhanced. In addition, the times during which the plant and machinery used to undertake the proposed works can be operated should be restricted, to prevent noise and disturbance to neighbours.
19. However, I disagree that details of car parking layouts and other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas are needed, as these are adequately shown on the application plans. This scheme relates to proposed extensions to the current bungalow. Consequently, I consider that it would be unreasonable and unnecessary to require details of means of enclosure, minor artefacts and structures, furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, details of functional services, retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration. I have been given no compelling explanation as to why such information would be needed, and in this context I consider that it would not be.
20. Conditions have also been suggested by others. The County Council's Historic Environment Unit indicates that the site is in an Area of Archaeological Significance. They say that this includes a medieval and later settlement, where evidence of Roman occupation has been found. Given their comments, there seems a reasonable probability that the proposed driveway turning head would be very near, or actually on, the site of a known lime kiln. I therefore agree that a condition requiring archaeological monitoring, recording and reporting is needed.
21. Furthermore, I agree with the Highways Authority that implementation of the proposed driveway alterations, turning head and parking space should be required, and that these areas should be hard surfaced. This is necessary to make sure that vehicles can be manoeuvred safely over the gradient involved, and be parked, without problems. To prevent water running onto the highway, the driveway should also include surface water drainage measures. However, given the generous amount of space available on the site, it is improbable that parking, storage or other activities associated with the construction works would take place on the highway, especially given its limited width here. In my view, a condition on this point would be unnecessary.
22. Finally, the Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust say that the appeal site is adjacent to an identified Wildlife Site. However, as I have been given no details of its precise boundaries, I cannot judge the likelihood of the scheme resulting in storage taking place on it, or access being taken through it. In this context, it would be unreasonable to conclude that a condition preventing this is necessary. Whilst the provision of bat and bird boxes, and the water saving and other measures referred to may be desirable, I consider that the scheme should not be prevented in their absence and, as such, they would be unnecessary.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Berkeley

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) No development shall take place until a scheme of landscaping has been approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include full details of the tree or plant species proposed, their locations and planting density, and of the proposed finished levels or contours, along with the timetable for undertaking the planting and land re-profiling works.
- 4) The scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved timetable. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 5) Before the first occupation of the development the driveway, turning head and space for car parking shall be constructed in accordance with drawing number 0713-PL03, and shall be surfaced with surface water drainage measures installed in accordance with details first approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 6) During all works on site, no plant or machinery shall be operated on the site outside the hours of 07.30 to 18.30 Mondays to Fridays and 07.30 to 13.00 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- 7) The development shall only be undertaken in accordance with a scheme of archaeological monitoring, which shall first have been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include measures for monitoring for archaeological remains during site works, the investigation and recording of any remains encountered, and for the production of a written report detailing any finds.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2009

by **David Brooks DipTP MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
21 October 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/A/09/2107312

**Hunsdon House Lodge, Church Lane, Hunsdon, Ware, Hertfordshire,
SG12 8PP**

- 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 R Garwood against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
- The application Ref 3/09/0196/FP, dated 9 February 2009, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2009.
- The development proposed is a new triple garage and store and alterations to existing swimming pool to convert into proposed games room and guest room.

Procedural Matter

1. The application included alterations to an existing swimming pool building and its conversion into a games room and guest room. The Council has stated that this aspect of the proposal is acceptable and has refused permission solely in respect of a new triple garage and store. I also understand that a separate application has been made for the conversion of the swimming pool building and planning permission has been granted (3/09/0690/FP). However, as this part of the proposal remains before me for determination I too see no reason why planning permission should be withheld for the swimming pool conversion and I have, therefore, issued a split decision in this appeal.

Decision

2. I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to a new triple garage and store. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission insofar as it relates to alterations to existing swimming pool to convert into proposed games room and guest room at Hunsdon House Lodge, Church Lane, Hunsdon, Ware, Hertfordshire, SG12 8PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/09/0196/FP, dated 9 February 2009 and the plans submitted with it subject to the following condition.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the locality and on the setting of the Listed Building having regard to national and local planning policies for the built heritage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site lies in the countryside and contains the host dwelling, a Grade II Listed Building, an adjoining garage with a low pitched roof and a single storey swimming pool building further away in the grounds. The triple garage and store would replace the garage.
5. I note, however, that whilst the existing garage has a footprint of almost 21sqm, the triple garage and store would have a footprint of about 72sqm, which would approach the scale of the footprint of the host dwelling. The submitted plans also indicate that the triple garage and store would have a roof hipped at either end in contrast to the gabled design of the roof of the host dwelling. In my view, in terms of scale, proportion and overall design, this would produce an incongruous and uncomfortable relationship to the host dwelling in contrast to the subordinate character of the existing garage. In this respect, I share the Council's concern that the cumulative effect of the new building at the site combined with the mass of the existing swimming pool building would be disproportionate to the original dwelling and further harm the character and appearance of the locality.
6. I therefore consider that the erection of the triple garage and store would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the openness of the locality. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies GBC3 and ENV5 of the adopted East Herts Local Plan Second Review 2007 (LP) which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that in the countryside, extensions to dwellings do not disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling.

Listed Building

7. I recognise that certain design features of the triple garage and store, such as the brick plinth and exposed rafter feet would echo features found in the host dwelling. However, the use of a hipped roof with natural slates would not, in my view, sympathise with the gabled roof with clay tiles found in the host dwelling. Added to which, I also consider that the uncompromising size and proportion of the triple garage and store in such a close relationship with the Listed Building, would harm its character and appearance.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would neither preserve nor enhance the setting of the Listed Building and as such, the development would be contrary to Policy BH12 of the LP which seeks, amongst other matters, to protect the character and setting of Listed Buildings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to an unimplemented and now lapsed planning permission and Listed Building Consent granted in 2001 for a 2-storey extension to the host dwelling. I have no details of this scheme before me but recognise that, at the time, the Council will have concluded that the scale, form and design of the extension would have preserved the character and setting of the Listed Building. In addition, at my visit I was able to see the development at the nearby property, The Warren, and although I appreciate the appellant's reference to the scale of the new building, I formed the impression that the

work was in proportion to the host dwelling which, I understand, is also not a Listed Building.

10. The Council proposed 2 conditions if the appeal were to succeed. The second, relating to materials of construction is not necessary as the work to the swimming pool building only involves internal re-construction.
11. I have also had regard to the appellant's needs in relation to safety and security. However, I find that this and none of the other considerations outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality and particularly, the setting of the Listed Building. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in relation to the new triple garage and store and allowed in respect of the swimming pool conversion.

David Brooks

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2009

by **Simon Berkeley BA MA MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email:enquiries@pins.gsi.g
ov.uk

Decision date:
22 October 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/A/09/2110029

Goddards, Hunsdon Road, Widford, Hertfordshire SG12 8SE

- 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 Mrs Nadine Radford against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
- The application reference 3/09/0477/FP, dated 27 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2009.
- The development proposed is a detached pool house ancillary to the house.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a detached pool house ancillary to the house at Goddards, Hunsdon Road, Widford, Hertfordshire SG12 8SE in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 3/09/0477/FP, dated 27 March 2009, 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) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed pool house on the setting of the Listed Building and on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Goddards is a substantial detached house and a Grade II Listed Building in the rural Widford Conservation Area. I note that the Council says it is also listed in the Royal Commission Inventory of English Houses 1200 – 1800. It is of some size and is set in rather generous grounds, including large formal gardens to the side and rear, which I consider form a clear and attractive part of the building's setting.
4. At 21.83 metres long and eight metres wide, and with a height of 7.14 metres to its roof ridge, the detached pool house proposed would be quite large. However, close to the rear garden's southern boundary, it would be 43 metres from the main facing elevation of the house, and around 38 metres from the

side conservatory. In my view, this is a considerable distance. At the garden's edge, largely beyond intervening manicured topiary, the pool house would not be an excessively dominant feature.

5. The extent of glazing in the side elevations between the fairly slender brick pillars proposed would give the structure a somewhat lightweight appearance. It would be quite visually permeable, such that from areas around the main house, the high boundary hedge behind the pool house would be discernable. I accept that the building's generally more contemporary arrangement and use of materials would not replicate the main house. Nevertheless, I see no particular reason why that should be a disadvantage. Indeed, its simpler composition, long, narrow form and quite steeply pitched roof, along with the timber horizontal cladding boards proposed, would be evocative of more traditional outbuildings in the area. This, in my view, along with the position proposed, would reinforce the nature of the two building's hierarchical association.
6. Put simply, despite its size, the pool house would occupy only a proportionately small corner of the grounds, and would appear as a secondary, subservient outbuilding, reflecting its ancillary functional connection with the main house. Even if the trees and other landscaping were to be removed, including the dense trees, bushes and hedging along the property boundaries that would otherwise largely hide it, this relationship would be retained. Consequently, to my mind, it would not detract from Goddard's special architectural qualities or historical interest, or be out of keeping here.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed pool house would preserve or enhance the setting of the Listed Building and the character or appearance of the Widford Conservation Area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies BH12 and BH6 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review. The former permits developments that affect the setting of a listed building, provided that the setting is preserved or enhanced. The latter permits development in conservation areas where they are sympathetic in terms of scale, height, proportion, form, materials and siting in relation to the general character and appearance of the area or are otherwise of such quality as to be highly likely to enhance the character and appearance of the area. In addition, it would not be contrary to Local Plan Policy ENV1, which requires all development proposals to be of a high standard of design and layout reflecting local distinctiveness.
8. I acknowledge that the Council's reason for refusal refers to Local Plan Policy ENV5. However, in respect of settlements defined in the Local Plan as Category 2 Villages, such as Widford, that policy refers only to extensions to dwellings. As an outbuilding is clearly proposed here, rather than an extension, that policy is not relevant in this case.
9. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of advice in Circular 11/95. I agree that samples of the building's external materials should be approved by the Council, to make sure that the quality of its appearance is satisfactory. I shall impose an appropriate condition accordingly. However, the development sought by this application, and the permission conveyed by my decision, relates only to a detached pool house that is ancillary to the main house. A condition specifically requiring adherence to this use would therefore be unnecessary.

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Berkeley

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2009

by **Simon Berkeley BA MA MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsl.gov.uk

Decision date:
22 October 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/09/2111680

Lorraine, Slough Road, Allens Green, Sawbridgeworth CM21 0LR

- 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 & Mrs Holbrook against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
- The application reference 3/09/0994/FP, dated 1 July 2009, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2009.
- The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and outbuildings, replacement roof extension with dormers and rooflights, one and a half storey side extension with dormers, two storey rear extension, and revised vehicular parking and turning area.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the demolition of existing garage and outbuildings, replacement roof extension with dormers and rooflights, one and a half storey side extension with dormers, two storey rear extension, and revised vehicular parking and turning area at Lorraine, Slough Road, Allens Green, Sawbridgeworth CM21 0LR, in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 3/09/0994/FP, dated 1 July 2009, 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) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) Before the development is first occupied, the driveway, turning and parking areas shall be constructed in accordance with drawing number 0913/PL/200 and shall be hard surfaced in materials that shall first have been approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 4) Before the commencement of the development, the garage and outbuildings attached to it shall be removed as indicated on drawing number 0913/PL/150.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt.
-

Reasons

3. Lorraine is a detached bungalow on a long, narrow plot. It is one of a number of properties forming a ribbon of residential development in the countryside.
4. This area is defined in the East Herts Local Plan Second Review as the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt. Local Plan Policy GBC3 sets out the kinds of development appropriate here, and allows limited extensions or alterations to existing dwellings. Paragraph 4.5.1 explains that the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt comprises approximately the northern two thirds of the district's area, and is a considerable and significant rural resource. It says that the strategy of the Structure Plan is to concentrate and direct development to the main settlements.
5. In addition, in such areas, Policy ENV5 requires extensions to be of a scale and size that would either by itself, or cumulatively with other extensions, not disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling nor intrude into the openness or rural qualities of the surrounding area. From paragraph 8.9.1 of the Local Plan, I understand that the policy objective here is to prevent harm to the character and appearance of existing dwellings and the locality, and to ensure a supply of smaller dwellings outside the main towns and settlements.
6. Currently, at around 103 square metres in area, Lorraine is not a large bungalow. The extensions proposed would expand its footprint by roughly 59 square metres. This, as I see it, would amount to only a limited enlargement of the area it occupies.
7. On the other hand, though, the main roof ridge would be raised by 1.7 metres and along with the side extension would have first floor accommodation in the roof space, and the rear extension would rise to two storeys in height. These additions, along with the pitch roofed dormer windows proposed, would increase the building's volume more significantly.
8. That being said, the scheme also involves the demolition of an outbuilding close to the bungalow, which includes a garage and other storage space. Though single storey, this structure is quite long and of some size. To my mind, this should not be overlooked and, given its removal, the extent of the overall volume increase would be considerably less. Indeed, taking this into account, I consider that the development would be sufficiently limited, and would not disproportionately alter the size of the original dwelling.
9. Despite the height of the proposed rear extension's eaves line, its roof ridge would remain below that of the main house. Its eaves and glazed doors and windows in the gable would not be seen in the context of the existing bungalow, but rather in that of the extended dwelling, including the raised roof and dormer windows to either side of it. While this is rather different to the current design style, I see no reason why the rear extension would detract from the proposed composition, or be out of keeping with the resultant house.
10. There are a number of sizeable detached residential properties in this row, including Parklands, immediately neighbouring Lorraine. Many have dormer windows on their front roof slopes, and Parklands has a rearward projecting element akin to that proposed here. Among these, the house formed by the proposed extensions and other alterations would not look out of place. It

would not be visually dominant or stand out in this row of properties, or otherwise detract from the rural qualities of the surrounding area.

11. I accept that the introduction of some built development where currently there is none would reduce openness. But in the setting of this linear stretch of buildings, and in this rather generous plot, the effect would be limited. Removing the outbuilding as proposed would provide adequate redress, and sufficiently retain the sense of space between neighbouring properties.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt, and openness here. Neither would it undermine the Council's spatial approach on the location of new development, or weaken the provision of smaller homes in the countryside, to any material degree. Consequently, it would not conflict with Local Plan Policies GBC3 and ENV5. In addition, it would accord with the aims of Local Plan Policies ENV1 and ENV6. The former requires a high standard of design and layout to reflect local distinctiveness, and expects developments to complement the existing grain of development, and to relate to the massing and height of adjacent buildings and the surroundings. The latter seeks to ensure extensions either match or are complimentary to the design and materials used in the original building and its setting. It also says that side extensions should ensure appropriate space is left between the flank wall and common curtilage of the neighbouring property. This policy accepts roof dormers if appropriate to the design and character of the original dwelling and its surroundings, and seeks to prevent dormers dominating the roof form.

Other matters

13. The Council's second reason for refusing the application says the development would be tantamount to the creation of a replacement dwelling, and would be contrary to Local Plan Policies GBC3 and HSG8 as a consequence. I acknowledge that the extensions and other alterations proposed, including the re-arrangement of the current fenestration, would result in a property of markedly different appearance. Nonetheless, a replacement dwelling is not the development sought by this application. Moreover, the existing bungalow's outer walls would remain as a central component of the building's structure. In this context, I consider there to be no compelling argument to judge the scheme on this basis.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of advice in Circular 11/95. To make sure the proposed development does not look out of place, I agree that the Council should approve samples of the external materials proposed to be used.
15. The Council's officer report indicates that the Highways Authority have also suggested conditions. The Highways Authority's comments have not been provided to me, and the Council have not put forward those conditions advocated. Nevertheless, I agree it is necessary to ensure that the driveway, turning and parking areas proposed are laid out and hard-surfaced as shown on the application plans, so that vehicles can enter and leave the site in forward gear. However, while the officer report refers to provision for the storage of

materials on the site, this is not explained further. Consequently, I cannot determine the necessity of such a condition.

16. Finally, though not suggested by the Council, my judgement on the main issue turns on the removal of the existing outbuilding. Consequently, it is necessary to secure this through a planning condition. I shall impose appropriate conditions accordingly.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Berkeley

INSPECTOR