



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by **K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X1925/D/25/3370432

56 Chilvers Bank, Baldock, Hertfordshire, SG7 6HT

- 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 Mr C Grindal against the decision of North Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00846/FPH.
 - The development proposed is a front loft dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed front loft dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Chilvers Bank.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a mid-terraced house in a well-established street of similar, mainly semi-detached and terraced houses. It is situated in a prominent location on a bend in the street but set back from the highway behind a small green with trees. The building line is uneven but there is a uniformity in the scale, materials and character of the dwellings. The appeal dwelling, No 56, is set slightly back from No 54 but shares a building line with No 58 which has a modest two storey front extension under a pitched, hipped roof, set away from No 56.
4. The proposed front dormer would occupy less than half the width of the roof but would extend almost to the ridge and almost down to the eaves. It would have a flat roof, be clad in zinc and have a centrally located, high level window. It would be a prominent and clearly visible addition at roof level. The boxy shape of the dormer and use of zinc cladding would draw attention to the structure in the context of the generally uniform roof-scape of pitched, tiled roofs. The window would not relate well in either position or shape to those in the main façade of the dwelling, adding to the incongruous appearance of the dormer as a whole. I did not see any similar front dormers in the street.
5. The appellant suggests that the existing variety in the street, including variations in the building line and the front extension at No 58, together with the fact that the site is not within a designated area, would allow for a degree of flexibility. However, these differences have a limited effect on the roofs which remain generally uniform.

The unsympathetic disruption of the predominantly consistent roof-scape in a prominent location would thus materially detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling, the terrace and the street scene of Chilvers Bank.

6. The appellant further suggests that the scale of the proposed dormer would be modest, such that it remained subservient to the dwelling, and the use of zinc cladding would provide a high quality finish. However, despite its limited width I do not consider the dormer to be a modest structure and whilst the zinc cladding may be of high quality it would be a stark and unsympathetic material in this setting.
7. The two storey extension at No 58, which is a well-designed and sympathetic addition with a roof that complements the roof of the host dwelling, would not justify the proposed development.
8. I note that the dormer is needed to allow for stairs to serve a proposed loft extension to sit above the existing stairs. I understand the desire to maximise habitable space in the converted loft and have sympathy with the needs of the appellant's family. Nevertheless, these would not outweigh the requirement to secure good visual design.
9. Finally, the appellant points out that there are other box dormers visible in the street scene of Chilvers Bank. However, those that I saw were all on rear roof slopes where their relationship with the street was different and they were generally less prominent. Moreover, they may have been constructed under permitted development rights. In any case, their presence is not comparable with and would not justify allowing the proposed front dormer.
10. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed front loft dormer would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Chilvers Bank. In consequence, it would conflict with Policies D1 and D2 of the adopted North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 – 2031. Taken together and amongst other things, these expect extensions to dwellings to be sympathetic to the existing house in height, form, proportions, roof type, window details and materials and to respond positively to the site's local context.
11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR