

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/17/3173904

100 Cunningham Way, Leavesden, Watford, WD25 7NL

- 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 Panton against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/2492/FUL was refused by notice dated 27 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is: a first floor build over, loft conversion and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.100 Cunningham Way is a two-storey detached dwelling located in a modern housing estate. It is the end building of a row of six dwellings, four of which have a similar gabled design and external materials, with cat-slide roofs above a garage. Two dwellings in the group differ, having hipped roofs with rendered front elevations. A row of dwellings of different design at Braham Crescent face the front elevation of the appeal building across an area of open space. There is a general variety of house styles within the estate, but there are elements of design consistency, as in the group including No.100 Cunningham Way.
4. The appeal building is prominent when approached up the slope of Cunningham Way. The group of dwellings including the appeal building may also be overlooked from other dwellings because of the intervening open space. The appeal proposal would add a crown roof and two Dutch hip roof forms to the building, plus front and rear dormers. This would significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling and disrupt the attractive rhythm in design of the group of dwellings.
5. Despite the existence of other varied house styles and the use of part hipped roof elements, the proposed extensions would appear incongruous and would unduly add bulk to the building, making it appear 'top heavy'. Although external materials matching those in the dwelling would be used, I consider that the changes are not within acceptable tolerances and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and design quality, contrary to

Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP12. The proposal would also harm the character and cohesive appearance of the group of buildings in which it forms an end dwelling. It would conflict with Development Management Policies Local Development Document policy DM1 and Appendix 2 which requires, amongst other things, that extensions must not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties and reflect the character of the streetscene. There would also be conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the appellant's offer to accept a condition regarding the scale and design of the proposed rear dormer. However, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR