

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 March 2021

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/W/20/3246447

127 Greenfield Avenue, WATFORD, WD19 5DG

- 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 Ms Simone Burns against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/2288/FUL, dated 27 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of some of the external walls, internal walls, and roofs. Change from hipped roof to gable roof, single-story rear extension, and first-floor extension over existing garage and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of some of the external walls, internal walls, and roofs. Change from hipped roof to gable roof, single-story rear extension, and first-floor extension over existing garage, at 127 Greenfield Avenue, WATFORD, WD19 5DG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2288/FUL, dated 27 November 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions and other alterations on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal documents indicate that the site contained a detached bungalow with a double hip 'pyramid' roof and garage and two storey extension to the side, but at my visit I noted that only the front wall of the property remained, the other exterior and interior walls and the roof having been demolished. It is proposed to extend the property over the garage and at the rear and have two gabled ends to the roof so as to have accommodation in the roof space lit by two small dormer windows in the front facing roof slope and a larger flat roof dormer in the rear slope.

Effect on character and appearance

4. While the majority of roofs on other properties locally are double hipped, the Council recognises that the form of many of the bungalows has changed over the years to one of a varied roofscape and there are examples of gable roofs in the vicinity of the site. Nevertheless, the Council submits that the type of

crown roof proposed would be contrary to the guidance in Design Criteria appended to the Development Management Document (DMD), which generally discourages crown roofs, and this type of roof would look out of place and prominent in the street scene.

5. There is a variety of bungalow designs in the local part of Greenfield Avenue and I noted gable roofs as well as hipped roofs with large dormers in front and side roof slopes. The adjoining property at No.125 is of this ilk and consequently the bulk and height of this property means that views of the proposed gable of the appeal site proposal would not be prominent in the street scene. The other adjoining property No.129 lies at a slightly lower level and at the moment has a traditional pyramid roof. Therefore, there would be some views of the proposed gable end when approaching along the street from the north. However, the overall appearance of the proposed roof form would be relatively contained and the visual impact would be limited. The new roof form would not appear materially out of place or harmful in the street scene.
6. I find that the proposal would still maintain the character of the area and would not harm the quality of the built environment. As such there is no conflict with Policy DM1 of the DMD. For similar reasons there is no conflict with Core Strategy Policy CP1 on securing sustainable development or Policy CP12 on the design of development.

Planning balance

7. Overall, I conclude that the proposal meets the requirements of the relevant provisions of the development plan and this is not outweighed by any other consideration. The appeal should therefore be allowed.
8. In terms of conditions, the Council recommends four. In addition to the standard conditions on the commencement of development and the listing of the plans that are approved, it is reasonable and necessary that the external materials of the proposed extensions are submitted to and approved by the Council as little of the original dwelling remains. Further, in this case there is justification for the removal of 'permitted development' rights to form new windows in the flank walls or roof slopes so as to avoid overlooking and maintain the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining properties. I will therefore impose these conditions.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 19-03-PL-001 Rev B, 19-03-PL-002 Rev A, 19-03-PL-003 Rev B, and 19- 04-PL-004 Rev B.
3. Building work shall not exceed ground level until the external materials of the permitted scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any other revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the flank elevations or roof slopes of the extension/development hereby approved.