



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/20/3257157
39 Melbourne Road, Bushey WD23 3LL

- 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 & Mrs Preston against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0619/HSE, dated 4 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as loft extension and conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is whether the development proposed would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Melbourne Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Melbourne Road Conservation Area (the CA). The National Planning Policy Framework requires that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
4. From the evidence submitted the CA derives its significance principally from the presence of the Grade II* listed building known as Lululand and the Grade II Registered Park and Garden known as The Rose Garden. Houses on Melbourne Road contribute to the character of the CA through their consistency of appearance and scale, which derives in part from the lack of significant alterations to the original buildings as seen from the street.
5. Within the stretch of Melbourne Road that falls within the CA every pair of semi-detached houses has hipped roofs to both houses. Gabled and part-gabled roofs are visible in the wider Melbourne Road street scene as well as to several properties in Herkomer Close opposite the appeal site. These properties form part of the setting of the CA but fall outside of it and their effect on its character is therefore limited in comparison to the consistency in appearance of the houses within the CA.

6. The development proposed would significantly alter the appearance of the appeal property. The alteration to a gable roof would unbalance this pair of semi-detached houses in the street scene. While the appeal proposal includes a partial hip to the roof, this would be insufficient to preserve the balanced appearance of this pair of houses. As the only example in a row of balanced pairs of hipped roofed semi-detached houses the gable roof would be a prominent feature in the street scene, and harmful to its character.
7. The proposed rear dormer would not be prominent in the street scene. However, it would be a large and bulky addition to the rear roof slope, visible from neighbouring properties, and as a result of its size and flat roof would be out of keeping with the character of these houses.
8. Lululand is a flat-roofed building neighbouring the appeal site. It is a separate building of very different character and appearance to No 39. It is set well back from the consistent building line along Melbourne Road of which the appeal property forms a part. The flat roof to Lululand does not justify the creation of the flat-roofed dormer that forms part of the appeal proposal.
9. The development proposed would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character of appearance of the CA. It would conflict with the requirements of Policies CS22 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy 2013 and SADM29 and SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, as well as guidance in the Planning and Design Guide Part E 2006. Together these seek to ensure that development protect, conserve or where possible enhance the significance, character and appearance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR