



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14/10/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/20/3248114

85 Little Oxhey Lane, Carpenders Park WD19 5HJ

- 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 Darren Linnell against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/2318/FUL, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and demolition of the side garage/outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and demolition of the side garage/outbuilding at 85 Little Oxhey Lane, Carpenders Park WD19 5HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2318/FUL, dated 22 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: PL-000, PL-001, PL-002, PL-003 Rev A, PL-004 Rev A, PL-005 Rev A, PL-006 Rev B and PL-007 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace, hipped roof, two storey property, sited on a roughly wedge-shaped plot. It is set back at an angle from St George's Drive, close to its junction with Little Oxhey Lane. There is a broadly similar terrace opposite, and semi-detached pairs of bungalows on rising ground to the north. Elsewhere on Little Oxhey Lane nearby properties are arranged in semi-detached pairs, with a masonry or rendered finish.

4. Compared to the host property, the roof of the proposed extension would be set well down; and the extension's front face would be significantly less wide and would be slightly recessed. The extension would also be set at least 1.2m from the boundary with 177 St George's Drive ('No 177'), in accordance with the Design Criteria at Appendix 2, Part 4(c) of the Three Rivers Development Management Policies LDD 2013 ('TRDMP'). Consequently, the scheme would not dominate the host's appearance, and the resultant dwelling would not appear cramped on its plot.
5. Although the proposed extension would be wider at the front than at the rear, its front corner would broadly align with the front corner of the bungalow at No 177. Given its siting away from the side boundary, its limited height, its set down on slightly lower ground, and its hipped roof form, the scheme, even with its splayed design, would not result in a contrived appearance, or an awkward relationship between these two properties.
6. Some other dwellings in the area have been extended, including, on the terrace opposite this one, a two storey side extension at 77 Little Oxhey Lane. Given the varied form and appearance of nearby properties, the scheme would not appear out of place.
7. In general terms, Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Three Rivers Core Strategy 2011 seek high design quality and development which respects its context and local distinctiveness. Amongst other things, Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the TRDMP set out that development should not have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area, and that extensions should respect the character of the existing dwelling and the streetscene.
8. For the above reasons, the scheme would not conflict with those policies, nor with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for visually attractive architecture.
9. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Additionally, in the interests of visual amenity, the suggested condition requiring that the extension be faced with matching materials is necessary.
10. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR