



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by Luke Simpson BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/W/21/3266469

9 Furze View, Chorleywood WD3 5HT

- 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 Veronika & Simon Reid against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2073/FUL, dated 30 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: 'demolition of existing bungalow and construction of a four bedroom house'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Chorleywood Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2035 (CNDP) was approved at referendum on 06 May 2021. The CNDP is now a 'made' plan and forms part of the adopted development plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host property currently comprises a single storey detached dwelling, which has a relatively traditional appearance. During my site visit, I noted that most of the dwellings on this side of Furze View are single storey and have unaltered front roof forms. There are some examples of different roof forms, and some neighbouring dwellings incorporate dormer windows and rooflights to the side and rear. There are also some two-storey properties in reasonably close proximity to the appeal site, but these are located on the opposite side of Furze View and on Hubbards Road, where the character of development is more varied. Notably, the height and massing of dwellings on this side of Furze View are predominantly consistent and this forms a key component of the harmonious character of the surrounding area.
5. Furze View is located towards the top of a hill, with the rising topography giving more prominence to the distinctive single storey character of development. The scale and height of existing properties notably changes when approaching Furze View from Hubbards Road, with larger two storey properties giving way to smaller single storey properties.

6. The proposed development would introduce an additional storey. To facilitate this the development includes an increased roof height and two front facing gables, with first floor windows set in below the ridgeline. I acknowledge that the maximum roof height would not increase significantly. I also accept that the proposed development would incorporate some reductions in roof height. However, even a minor increase in height in this location would be prominent, given the rising topography of Furze View. The Appellants state that, due to the topography, the proposed ridge height would exactly match that of 11 Furze View (No 11). Even accepting this, the resultant scale and appearance of the development would still appear at odds with the prevailing character (notably as No 11 is set at a higher ground level). In addition, this harm would be particularly noticeable when viewed in conjunction with 7 Furze View, which in contrast to No 11, is set lower than the appeal site.
7. The proposed alterations to the roof incorporate gable, hipped and crown elements, which would be at odds with the more consistent and traditional roof forms of development on this side of Furze View. I consider that the proposed development, by virtue of its bulk and scale, would have a harmful visual impact and would not be in keeping with the character of development on this side of Furze View.
8. The appellants refer to planning permission reference: 11/0473/FUL, which they state relates to a crown roof at 7 Furze View (No 7). However, no further details of this consent, nor the plans related to it, have been provided. In any case, during my site visit I noted that, when viewed from the front, the roof of No 7 currently has an appearance which is consistent with the stepped ridgelines here and also the design of the appellants existing property (and other than a roof light, the roof to the front appears unaltered).
9. The proposed design would be fairly contemporary, with large windows in the front facing gables, timber cladding, grey concrete roof tiles, white render and timber cladding to part of the front elevation. Whilst there are some examples of more contemporary updates to neighbouring properties, including those recently approved at No 7, I consider that the proposed materials would not be in keeping with the more traditional character of the surrounding area. This adds to the harm which I have already identified. The appellants have suggested that materials could be controlled by planning condition. However, in this case, the contemporary materials are an integral part of the design and to alter them would change the development significantly from that which is proposed. Therefore, a condition could not be reasonably imposed to address this harm.
10. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Core Strategy (2011) Policies CP1 and CP12, Local Plan Development Management Policies Local Development Document 2013 (DMD) Policy DM1 and CNDP Policy 2, which in part seek to ensure high quality design of new development, which respects local character. It would also be contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) paragraph 127, which states in part that development should add to the overall quality of the surrounding area.
11. The Council also refers to DMD appendix 2, which expands on Policy DM1. It states in part that where roof forms are of uniform style, height and appearance, it is unlikely that an increase in ridge height will be supported. The proposed development would conflict with this guidance.

12. The appellants have suggested that the proposed development would improve access for the elderly and those with disabilities. The appellant also suggests that the thermal insulation of the building would be improved. However, neither of these considerations would outweigh the visual harm which the proposed development would cause. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Luke Simpson

INSPECTOR