



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2018

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/W/17/3180776

Pindari, Quickley Rise, Chorleywood, Hertfordshire WD3 5PE

- 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 Mark Herbert against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/2421/FUL, dated 21 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is part demolition, plot subdivision and the erection of a new two storey house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Pindari is a detached house located on the south-eastern side of Quickley Rise close to a bend in the road that leads to a turning head at the end of this cul-de-sac. The property is one of a line of four detached houses on wide plots that have similar design features including gable end roofs and timber panelling to the front. They are also characterised by aligned front walls, narrow spacing between the dwellings, short front gardens and a line of protected fir trees in the back gardens. The surrounding area has a more varied residential character. On the opposite side of Quickley Rise are the back gardens to Sheldon and Woolston screened by dense vegetation whilst to the north of these are three new closely spaced large detached houses set at right angles to the road. There are three other detached houses set in spacious grounds around the turning head at the northern end of the road.
4. The proposal is to sub-divide the plot and to erect a 3 bedroom house to the north-east of Pindari. This would involve the demolition of a double garage with a living room over at Pindari to create a wider plot for the new house. New and retained dwellings would share the existing vehicular access. The proposal follows a previous scheme for a detached house that was refused permission and dismissed at appeal¹ in 2014.

¹ APP/P1940/A/13/2210347

5. The new dwelling would have the same orientation as others on this side of Quickley Rise, but would be set back about 2.5m behind the front elevation of Pindari. This would be a noticeable step in an otherwise strong building line to the adjacent four houses, even allowing for a shorter set back to Walton at the southern end of the row. Whereas Walton is also set away from the junction of Quickley Rise with Quickley Lane, the northern corner of the frontage and flank walls to the proposed dwelling would be very close to the return frontage to Quickley Rise. In these respects the proposal would have a conspicuous and uncharacteristic appearance in the street scene.
6. The dwelling would be significantly smaller than the other dwellings in the vicinity including the reduced form of Pindari alongside. Notwithstanding the use of matching external materials and a similar design approach, the mass and length of the new dwelling would appear as uncharacteristically small compared to others in the row on the south-eastern side of the road. The plot size would also be smaller than others in the road. By comparison with the more spacious setting of dwellings around the site, the proposal would appear as an incongruous feature, noticeably smaller and yet relatively cramped in relation to its siting close to Pindari and to the footway.
7. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (2011) (CS) that promote sustainable development with a high enduring design quality that respects local distinctiveness in relation to factors including character, layout and spacing. There would also be conflict with policy CS3 of the CS which requires development to make the most efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the environment and existing residential areas. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies LDD (2013) sets out detailed guidance for new residential development; the proposal would be contrary to the provision that layouts should maintain the particular character of the area in the vicinity of the site in terms of matters including plot size, building footprint, frontage building line and streetscape.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that policy CP2 of the CS identifies the need for smaller houses and that the proposal would help towards the general need for additional housing, but these points do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
9. The appellant refers to a fallback position relating to a Certificate of Lawfulness for the construction of an extension to Pindari and for a detached garage and workshop in a similar position to the proposed house. Whilst this may result in a greater quantum of development than the house, the garage would be single storey and much less conspicuous than the two storey dwelling that would be a prominent feature above the retained conifer hedge to the return frontage to Quickley Rise. The fallback position does not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR