



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2021

by Christopher Miell MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/20/3264329

Cloverleaf, Chapel Croft, Chipperfield WD4 9DR

- 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 Paul Gillespie against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01523/FHA, dated 15 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, rear balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and rear balcony at Cloverleaf, Chapel Croft, Chipperfield WD4 9DR in accordance with the terms of application, Ref: 20/01523/FHA, dated 15 June 2020, subject to the schedule of conditions attached to this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The Council explain that the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. On that basis, they have concluded that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I do not disagree with the views of the Council in respect of this matter and hence it does not fall to be considered as a main issue.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: (i) the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the effect of the development upon the setting of the Chipperfield Conservation Area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a substantial two storey detached dwelling known as Cloverleaf. The dwelling is accessed via a private road off Chapel Croft, which serves a total of three dwellings. The respective properties are situated within large plots, which creates a spacious character that contributes positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. It is proposed to erect a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and a rear balcony. The side extension would feature a double hipped roof form and would incorporate undercroft car parking at ground floor level.
6. Planning permission¹ was granted by the Council in June 2020 for the erection of a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and a rear balcony at the site. The main parties explain that the design, appearance and overall bulk, scale and mass of the approved single storey rear extension and rear balcony are identical to the current proposal. However, the approved two storey side extension features a catslide roof form with less floor area and built mass at first floor level, when compared to that of the current proposal.
7. Given the site's planning history, the dispute between the main parties primarily relates to the acceptability or otherwise of the proposed two storey side extension.
8. The proposed side extension would be set back from the principle elevation of the host building with a lower ridge height. Furthermore, the overall width and depth of the proposed side extension would be modest when compared to the proportions and scale of the existing dwelling. As such, the proposal would have a subservient relationship with the host building.
9. In terms of design and appearance, the external surfaces of the proposed extension would be constructed from materials to match the host building, whilst the double hipped roof form would respond positively to the roof form of the existing building, which has a double gabled roof form to the front and rear. Moreover, the fenestration arrangement on the proposed side extension would appear well balanced and in keeping with the host building.
10. When viewed in the context of the neighbouring dwellings, which are large detached properties with predominately brick exteriors and pitched roof forms, the overall appearance of the extended dwelling would be in-keeping with the local vernacular. In addition, the host building would retain a substantial plot, which would preserve the area's spacious character.
11. The Council argue that the proposed extension would have an inharmonious relationship with an existing side wing on the opposite side of the host building. Whilst I recognise that the proposed side extension would be larger than the existing side wing, when viewed cumulatively, by virtue of their modest proportions, when compared with the overall scale of the existing dwelling, the respective side extensions would retain a subordinate relationship with the host building. Consequently, I do not share the Council's position on this matter.
12. The Council have suggested that the design and appearance of the proposed undercroft could be improved through the inclusion of stone pillars and cambered arches. Whilst this may or may not be the case, such a proposal is not before me. As such, this is not a determinative point in this case.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy 2006-2031 (the 'CS') which state that development should enhance general character and respect adjoining properties in terms of site coverage, scale, height, bulk and materials.

¹ Council Ref: 20/00460/FHA

Conservation area

14. The boundary of the Chipperfield Conservation Area (the 'CA') cuts through the appeal site. The Council explain that a portion of the rear/side garden of the appeal property is located within the CA, whilst the dwelling itself is located outside of the CA boundary.
15. The CA encompasses the core of Chipperfield Village, Chipperfield Common and the surrounding rural landscape. The village has a semi-rural character with a loose knit pattern of development that is predominately clustered around the village green.
16. Given my findings in respect of the first main issue, I conclude that the proposal would have a neutral impact upon and thus preserve the setting of the CA and hence no harm would be caused to the significance of the CA by the proposed extension of the appeal property outside of it. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy CS27 of the CS, which requires new development to positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of conservation areas.
17. For this reason, the proposal would be consistent with Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conditions

18. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to materials.
19. In addition, in the interests of certainty, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring the proposed window openings to be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the proposed elevation plans, as opposed to the proposed floor plans, which contain a minor error, whereby two side facing ground floor window openings are shown, as opposed to three openings, which are shown on the proposed side elevation. If the window openings were to be carried out in accordance with the proposed floor plans, the fenestration of the side elevation would lack symmetry, which is an important design feature of the proposal.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Christopher Miell

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 approved plans: Drawing Nos: wren-naj-004b-2020 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), wren-naj-004c-2020 (Proposed First Floor Plan), wren-naj-004d-2020 (Proposed Elevation Plans) and CM-00567123 (Location Plan).
- 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.
- 4) Notwithstanding the details shown on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Drawing Nos: wren-naj-004b-2020), the proposed window openings hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the Proposed Elevation Plans (Drawing No: wren-naj-004c-2020).

***** END *****