



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2012

by **David Vickery DipT&CP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 27 March 2012

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/11/2165965**

**42 Hadham Road, Bishops Stortford, Hertfordshire CM23 2QT**

- 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 and Mrs Thomas Meager against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
  - The application Ref 3/11/1311/FP, dated 18 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2011.
  - The development proposed is to raise the existing roof pitch and construct a pitched roof dormer to the rear of the front elevation in order to provide two loft bedrooms with shared shower room facilities, including the installation of a new staircase from the existing first floor landing.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and/or appearance of the Bishops Stortford Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The property lies at the bottom of a steep valley with houses rising up on either side. As a consequence, despite good frontage vegetation screening, the roof is clearly seen from the bottom of Bells Hill, which is on rising ground to the south almost directly opposite the site. In these views, the roof is seen as being roughly the same height and pitch as the other roofs on the northern side of Hadham Road to the west and east, particularly the terrace to the west. It is these roofs that the property most intimately relates to, not those on the opposite, southern side of Hadham Road or Bells Hill.
4. The proposal would greatly add to the ridge height, and would create a large expanse of roof which would be clearly seen in medium distance views from opposite. The extra height of the side walls would also be briefly seen up the driveway of the appeal property and across the front garden of No. 40.
5. In these public views the extra roof and additional height of the side gables would make the appeal property appear dominant, intrusive and out of scale in this Conservation Area. The property would not, as it presently does, fit in with the physical context of surrounding slate roofs on this side of the road, which are presently modest and very similar in height. It would not respect the local

building traditions and roof relationships, and so it would not successfully integrate into the prevalent urban form.

6. The proposed small roof light would look out of place on such a large expanse of slate roofscape. Had I allowed this appeal I would have, as the appellants suggested, imposed a condition requiring its removal.
7. I appreciate the desire of the appellants to cater for their growing family, but the visual harm that would be caused by this proposal would continue long after those personal needs have passed.
8. I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the character and the appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies ENV1, ENV5, and BH6 in the Council's Local Plan.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Vickery*

INSPECTOR