The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2022

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/22/3292114
48 Brookdene Avenue, Oxhey Hall WD19 4LF

- 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 Ashley Roberts against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
- The application Ref 21/2335/FUL, dated 4 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2021.
- The development proposed is loft conversion including side and rear dormer with 500mm increase in roof height.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The boundary of the Oxhey Hall Conservation Area adjoins the bottom of the rear garden to 48 Brookdene Avenue but given the distance between the house and the boundary of the Conservation Area, it is not necessary to assess the proposal in terms of Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached house located in an elevated position on Brookdene Avenue. The houses along the road are varied in character although No 48 seems to be similar in design to Nos 50 and 52, both of which have been extended and altered but differently to that proposed for No 48.

5. The proposal would alter the shape of the roof from a hipped roof to a half-hip (or barn-hip or Dutch-hip) and a gable roof to a forward hipped projection. The roof would also be raised and dormers windows would be added to the side and rear. These alterations would significantly alter the appearance of the house.

6. Core Strategy[1] Policy CP12 establishes that the Council expect all development to have regard to local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area, amongst other things. Development Management Policies Document[2] Policy DM1 requires all residential development to satisfy the design criteria in Appendix 2. Amongst other things, this requires extensions not to be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent dwellings or the street scene and to respect the character of the property/street scene particularly with regard to roof form. I have also considered the National Planning Policy Framework[3] which also supports good design.

7. The proposed increase in roof height would be relatively modest but together with the altered shape of the roof and the added dormers would appear cumbersome and top heavy, adding bulk and massing at roof level that would harm the character and style of the existing dwelling.

8. Whilst I note that other properties have been extended and altered in the area and raising the roof for example, would in itself have a minimal impact, the cumulative effect of the roof alterations would be out of keeping with the overall design and character of the existing house. This would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area, especially highlighted due to the prominent elevated position of the house.

9. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with policies CP12 and DM1 together with the design criteria in Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies Document. The appeal therefore fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

[1] Three Rivers District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Adopted 17 October 2011.
[2] Three Rivers District Council Local Plan Development Management Policies Local Development Document, Adopted July 2013.
[3] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).