



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/21/3277350

48 Carrington Avenue, Borehamwood, WD6 2HA

- 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 A Driver against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0581/HSE, dated 17 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed garage and alterations to the front driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The northern side of Carrington Avenue is characterised by a diverse range of detached and semi-detached houses, set back from the street behind predominantly open and generous sized front gardens. These gardens contribute to the spaciousness of the road and form a break between the built development and Woodcock Hill Village Green on the southern side of Carrington Avenue. Some of the dwellings have garages which are either integral or located to the side of the houses, where they are not seen as isolated buildings within the front gardens.
4. The Appeal dwelling occupies a prominent position within the street scene, on the inside of a slight bend in the road and a short distance from one of the pedestrian accesses to Woodcock Hill Village Green. The appeal dwelling sits at a lower level to the highway and its generous sized front garden slopes down towards the dwelling. The garden is largely hard surfaced and enclosed by a low brick wall. Notwithstanding this it makes a valuable contribution to the open and spacious appearance of the street scene and the setting of the Woodcock Hill Village Green.
5. Collectively and amongst other things, the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (Framework), policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Local Plan - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 (DMP), and policies SP1 and CS22 of the Hertsmere Local Plan Development Plan

Document Core Strategy 2013 (CS), seek to ensure that new development is designed to a high standard and makes a positive contribution to the built environment.

6. Together and amongst other things parts D & E of the Hertsmere – Planning and Design Guide 2006 (SPD), encourage front garden development that adds colour, texture, variety and a sense of character within the street scene. They advise that garages should not dominate the streetscape and should be subordinate in appearance to the main elevation of the dwelling.
7. The proposed single garage would be sited close to the front boundary of the property and would be partly accommodated below ground level. Due to its lower ground level the proposed garage would sit below the top of the boundary wall and plants would be grown in the small planting strip between the garage and the front boundary and crossover.
8. The garage's 'green' roof would be visible from the adjacent pavement, although over time it could be further screened by the planting to the rear of the garage. It's roof and upper walls would visible when approaching from the east. Whilst views of the garage would be limited, where it could be seen the garage would have an urbanising impact on the front garden environment and would be out of keeping with the street scene. It would be seen as intruding into the open and spacious front garden environment.
9. As a consequence, the proposed garage would materially and unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the wider street scene, including the setting of Woodcock Hill Village Green. This is not a matter that could be satisfactorily dealt with by condition.
10. Whilst it is acknowledged that each planning proposal should be dealt with on its individual merits, decision making also needs to be consistent. In this instance, having regard to the harm that would be caused by the proposed garage, it would set an undesirable precedent for similar proposals in other comparable front gardens within the immediate area.
11. Finally, the appellant has confirmed that the excavated depth of the garage would be 1.26 metres at its entrance and 1.6 metres at the road end of the garage. To access the garage and from the information submitted considerable engineering works would be required within the front garden. As these works are significant and integral to the proposal, they are not a matter that could reasonably be dealt with by condition. Accordingly, had I found in favour of the appellant in relation to the main issue this is a matter about which I would have sought further details.
12. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character of the wider street scene. Accordingly, it would conflict with the DMP Policy SADM30, CS Policies SP1 & CS22, the SPD Part D and the Framework.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR