

Appeal Decision

Site visit made 16 September 2021

By Ruth Reed BA DipArch MA PGCertEd PPRIBA HonAIA FRIAS

An Independent Scheme of Management Inspector
Appointed by the Heritage Foundation Letchworth Garden City

Decision date 29 September 2021

Appeal Reference RR/2021/010

17 Pasture Road, Letchworth Garden City, Hertfordshire, SG6 3LP

- The appeal is made by [REDACTED] against refusal of consent under the Scheme of Management of Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation for the application submitted on 9 October 2020.
 - Consent was refused by the Heritage Advice Service on 29 October 2020. It was reviewed by the Advisory Management Committee on 11 March 2021 and the decision to refuse was upheld.
 - The development proposed is: Two storey rear extension, two-storey side extension and first floor extension above part of garage plus roof extensions to existing hips to form gables and alteration to fenestration
-

Decision

1. The appeal against the refusal of an application for two storey rear extension, two-storey side extension and first floor extension above part of garage plus roof extensions to existing hips to form gables and alteration to fenestration is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues in this case are whether adequate information has been provided to enable a full evaluation of the proposal; impact of the alterations to the street scene and the character of the area; impact of the proposals to the scale and appearance of the side and rear elevations.

Reasons

3. 17 Pasture Road is a two-storey dwelling with a one-and a half storey garage to the front, a single storey side extension for a gym and single storey full width lean-to extension to the rear elevation with a sunroom extension central to

the elevation. The house has a hipped roof with brick gables. The front and rear elevations have tile hanging to the first floor and the ground floor of the front elevation is rendered.

4. The appellant's agent gave a verbal clarification of the proposed alterations to the house but was unable to give a definitive answer for the height of the ridge for the existing and the proposed. From the information provided the new ridge height would be higher.
5. The unequal pitch or difference in eaves height implied by the roof lines imposed on the first-floor plan of the proposed, are not evident on the proposed south elevation.
6. No drawn details have been provided for the change of materials, in particular the junction between the existing brickwork and the proposed replacement brickwork on the front elevation.
7. The information provided is insufficient to confirm what changes are proposed. It is not possible to be certain of the impact of the changes to the roof and the materials to make an informed decision.
8. The hip to gable roof extension that will result in a higher ridge, the two-storey side extension to the north of the house replacing the gym extension, and the extension of the garage to a full two storeys would all have the effect of increasing the size and impact of the house when viewed from the road.
9. The house is set back from the road and screened from its neighbours by trees when seen from the road. The amount of increase in the ridge height is not defined, however it is possible that the change in scale of the house would not have a significant effect on the character of the area, but this would require more accurate drawings to confirm this.
10. The architectural style of the house would be changed with the new materials, windows, including a circular window, and stone window surrounds. The size and location of the openings would remain similar to the existing. From my walk around the adjacent roads, I could see that house styles were very varied, but they did include at least two similar in appearance to the change in style proposed for 17 Pasture Road.
11. I consider that the proposed changes visible at the front of the dwelling may not have a negative impact on the character of the street scene of Pasture Road provided that the height of the ridge could be defined. As required by the Design Principles for Modern Character Areas it could relate well with the original and neighbouring houses and their context.
12. The entire rear elevation of the existing house and the single storey extensions would be removed and replaced with a full-width two-storey extension

- including the additional width to the northern side of the house, forming a two-storey wrap-around extension. The rear extension would be over 6 metres in depth from the line of the first floor of the original house. The roofline would be formed of three gables with valley gutters. There would be substantial areas of glazing.
13. To the south elevation there would be a new single-storey extension. The effect of this would be to make the access to the rear of the dwelling cramped.
 14. The scale of the proposed rear extension would be out of proportion to the existing house. The consequence of the two-storey wrap-around extension is to create a lengthy, largely featureless wall to the north elevation. The proposed fenestration to the rear elevation would not reflect the pattern of openings on the existing house.
 15. The side and rear extensions would not meet the Design Principles, in particular the requirement that rear and side extensions should complement the existing character of the original house and have balanced proportions and scale.

Conclusions

16. Having read the submissions and seen the site and its context I conclude that there is insufficient information to confirm the height of the roof alterations and their impact on the street scene and that the side and rear extensions are harmful to existing character of the house and not in accordance with the Design Principles for Modern Character Areas. The appeal is dismissed.

Ruth Reed

Independent Scheme of Management Inspector