
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/19/3234092

17 Orchard Drive, Chorleywood WD3 5QN

- 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 Ashley Sanders against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0932/FUL, dated 15 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of first floor extension, single storey side extension and single storey front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the name of the appellant from the appeal form as the details have been redacted on the submitted application form.
3. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice noting that it has been agreed by the appellant and more accurately describes the proposal.
4. The appellant has been provided with opportunity to comment on the Council's delegated report. Whilst they have expressed concern that this may not have been written contemporaneously with the Council's decision, they have agreed that it may be referenced within the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the single-storey side and first-floor rear extensions on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The first-floor extension would be constructed over the existing ground-floor structure to the rear of this detached chalet bungalow. It would obviate its flat roof, and two of the three existing dormer windows within the rear roof slope. It would be set in from the side elevations and have a ridge level to match the host building. However, the proposal details higher eaves and introduces flanking flat roof dormers. Furthermore, the roof design would adjoin the retained pitched dormer window within the rear roof slope. Due to the high eaves, the flanking flat roof dormers and relationship to the existing rear

dormer, the first-floor extension would appear contrived and awkward. Additionally, the 2-storey projecting gable end would appear as a substantial mass and bulk compared to the modest and unassuming rear elevation of the chalet bungalow. Therefore, the proposal would not reflect good design and would be unsympathetic to the host building. I do not consider that the proposed use of matching materials and presence of other flat roof dormers within the locality mitigate the harm I have identified.

7. In addition, the proposal includes works to the front and side. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment in regard to the front porch and consider it to be a sympathetic alteration. Furthermore, to the side, the proposal includes the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a single-storey extension set in from the side boundary. It would have a pitched roof to the front and a flat roof to the rear concealed by a dummy pitch. Whilst the eaves would be higher than that of the front elevation's catslide roof, I note that the frontage has variation in eaves height and that the extension would be set back. Therefore, the form, materials and siting of the side extension would ensure that it would be sympathetic and subservient to the host building and ergo the street scene. However, my assessment on these elements does not affect my conclusions regarding the rear extension's design.
8. Whilst the rear extension would be largely obscured from public vantage points on Orchard Drive, limited views of the first-floor extension's roof would be available from the south. Views from Orchard Close are restricted by existing vegetation in a number of rear gardens. However, I am mindful that views are subject to change. Albeit relatively distant, public views are available from the footpath to the north-east (Chorleywood 014). Additionally, the proposal would be clearly visible from neighbouring property, though I note that no neighbour objection or parish council objection have been received. Despite the limited public visibility of the first-floor rear extensions, I find that the proposal would still form a part of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. For the reasons set out above I consider it be unsympathetic and would fail to take opportunities to enhance the character and appearance of the area.
9. Therefore, I find, due to the scale, height, bulk, massing and roof design of the first-floor rear extension that the proposal would fail to represent good design. For those reasons, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would conflict with the Council's adopted October 2011 Three Rivers District Council Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP12 and adopted July 2013 Three Rivers District Council Development Management Policies Local Development Document Policy DM1 and appendix 2. Amongst other aims these seek high quality design and to ensure that development does not lead to the gradual deterioration in the quality of the built environment.
10. The appellant highlights that the proposal would make a more efficient use of the land without the loss of any garden and without increasing the footprint. However, I do not find that this outweighs the harm I have found.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR