

PLANNING STATEMENT TO SUPPORT A REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING DWELLING FOLLOWING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE. REPLACEMENT OF HANGING TILE TO EXISTING DWELLING WITH A HARDIE PLANK CEMENT BASED CLADDING IN LIGHT GREY AT 23 THE ROWANS, BALDOCK, HERTFORDSHIRE, SG7 6HL

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is the second to be submitted this year involving extensions to No 23 The Rowans. The first (Council reference: 26/00228/FPH) was refused for the following reason:

The proposed two storey extension, by reason of its scale and design would result in an unsympathetic bulky addition to the existing dwelling, resulting in a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the property and a failure to retain the open character and wider context of the locality. The proposed development would fail to comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 and Section 12 of the NPPF 2024.

- 1.2 It was clear from this decision (and from the case officer's report upon the application) that it was only the two storey side extension which the Council found to be unacceptable. On this basis, and in order to get the comprehensively planned extensions, an appeal was lodged against this decision. After considering the appeal development the Inspector dismissed it. The reasons for the dismissal will be amplified later in this statement. Most importantly however, in the context of any subsequent resubmission, the Inspector opened by stating that No 23's plot size and spacing create an opportunity for a **significant extension** (my emphasis).
- 1.3 The two storey element was not found to be unacceptable in principle. The Inspector however found that the proposal would very substantially increase the house's visual impact. So, having reflected on the decision the applicants have addressed the concerns that led the Inspector to conclude that the previous scheme would increase the house's visual impact and are submitting this revised application accordingly.

- 1.4 The revised extensions are shown on drawings MOR/26/5A (Site Plan) 4A (Roof Plan) and 3A (Plans and Elevations).

2.0 ADDRESSING THE INSPECTORS COMMENTS

- 2.1 The starting point for this application is the extent to which the revisions to the unsuccessful appeal scheme have overcome the elements of that scheme that the Inspector found to be unacceptable. The Inspector acknowledged that No 23 could accommodate a significant extension. In this context the extension could be large and remain two storey. The case officer is unconvinced that a two storey extension is appropriate, but this is an opinion that was not held by the Inspector.
- 2.2 The depth of the side extension has been significantly reduced from 11.007m to 9.75m at ground floor and 8.200m at first. It would not now be deeper in plan form than the existing house. It would not now nearly double the length of full height 2 storey side walls facing the end of the cul-de-sac, which the Inspector felt added to the bulk. The width has also been reduced from 5.85m to 5.524m. The result of these significant reductions would not create an overly bulky structure, but one that is subsidiary to and in proportion with the existing house and others nearby.
- 2.3 The ridge of the roof has been dropped slightly and given a gabled end. The ridge has changed direction to tie more traditionally with the existing roof. The two and single storey side wall would no longer be blank in design, and not accentuate its massing. It is no longer featureless. In its revised form it would not be imposing nor an unsympathetic addition to the street scene.
- 2.4 The Council was also concerned that the extension would close down the open space between Nos 23 and 27. The 2 storey extension as now designed (and which the Inspector agreed with in principle) would continue to leave a wider gap to No 27 because of the private drive between the 2 houses. It would also be set back from the street and building frontage. This revised scheme, like the last, would not therefore cause any significant loss of openness. The existing flank boundary fence and landscaping will be retained.

3.0 SUMMARY

- 3.1 After the obvious disappointment of losing their appeal against the previous refusal the applicants have made conscious decisions and efforts to revise the internal floorspace and external appearance of the two storey extension. These are represented in this latest application. The prime objective has been to address all of those elements of the previous development which the Inspector found counted against it, and to produce an acceptable second submission.
- 3.3 The existing dwelling, because of its location, can take a significant extension. The reductions in bulk and changes to the appearance from the unsuccessful scheme have resulted in a far less bulky side extension and one that now fits comfortably into its spacious setting at the end of The Rowans cul-de-sac.
- 3.4 It is acknowledged that assessments of size and design are largely subjectively based. In this case the revised extension has been objectively assessed against the Inspector's reasoning for dismissing the appeal against the previous application. So, for all of the foregoing reasons, we hope that the Council will agree that the combination of changes that have now been in this revised application create a form of development that does not conflict with Policies D1 and D2 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 and Section 12 of the NPPF 2024 and grant planning permission accordingly.
- 3.5 However, in the event of this not being the case then we would welcome the opportunity to consider and respond to any further changes that might be required, before a decision is taken upon the application.

Alan Breckon
June 2026