



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/21/3275293

21 Parkway, Rickmansworth WD3 7AU

- 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 Tim Gowling and Georgina Ely against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0622/FUL, dated 9 March 2021, was refused by notice dated: 6 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension to the boundary following granting of permission 20/2820/FUL.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on a prominent corner position within an established residential area. Dwellings occupying corner plots are predominantly set back from the highway to varying extents. Most notably, the flank elevation of the corner property on the opposite side of the appeal property (24 Park Way) is set back from Mount View. Similarly, the properties on the remaining corners of the nearby junction are also set back from the highway and contribute to the areas spacious character.
4. Even though the gap between the flank gable of the appeal property and the highway is limited, this still provides some relief to the extent of the built development when viewed from the highway. Consequently, the appeal property is settled within the street scene and positively contributes to the prevailing arrangement of nearby dwellings.
5. In contrast, and notwithstanding some attention to its scale and design, the proposed side extension would be constructed up to the northern flank boundary of the appeal site, with only sufficient space for a boundary fence. This would remove the existing gap, and the tight arrangement of the new extension to the boundary fence would give it a cramped appearance, resulting in an erosive effect on the spacious character of the area. The introduction of a sizeable flank elevation in proximity of the highway would be an uncharacteristic and dominant feature in the street scene. Therefore, the

proposal would appear incongruous, and this would be exacerbated by the prominent position of the appeal property.

6. A similar extension has been approved at the appeal property and I have reviewed the appellants' evidence which compares this to the proposal. Nevertheless, the approved extension retains a gap from the side boundary and thereby reinforces the general arrangement of development on corner plots in the area. Therefore, the extant planning permission does not alter my findings on the proposal before me, which I have determined on its merits.
7. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find conflict with the design aims of Policy CP1 and CP12 Core Strategy, adopted October 2011, which together require new developments to have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area.
8. The proposal also fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document, adopted July 2013 ('LDD'). This requires that residential development meets the design criteria under Appendix 2 of the LDD, which amongst other things requires appropriate spacing between properties in character with the locality.

Other matters

9. The appellants suggest that the proposal is of a better design than that suggested by the Council. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal on the scheme before. Whilst the proposed extension would secure the layout required by the appellants' this does not outweigh the harm I have identified and conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR