



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022

**By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**  
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 26TH July 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/22/3290158**

**6 The Highlands Rickmansworth WD3 7EW**

- 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 Keith Bailey against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
  - The application Ref: 21/1996/FUL dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2021.
  - The development proposed is extend existing front dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of No.6 The Highlands and the surrounding street-scene.

### Reasons

3. No.6 The Highlands sits within a cul-de-sac of mid twentieth century semi-detached housing that have a shared design approach in the use of materials and architectural treatment. The proposal would infill the first floor roof slope over the garage and entrance area to create additional accommodation by the introduction of a widened dormer taking up the remaining width of the dwelling except for a nominal pitch section at the verge.
4. Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Three Rivers District Council Core Strategy 2011 (Core Strategy) makes clear that good design is an important facet of achieving sustainable development. Appendix 2 (Design Criteria) of the Three Rivers Development Management Policies Local Development Document 2013 (DMPLDD) provides criteria to be applied in extending buildings. Although, as guidance, such has to be applied with regard to the circumstances and effects of a particular proposal (which may in some cases determine no harm arises from a breach of guidance) to my mind the departure from the stated requirement that dormers should always be subordinate to the main roof and set back from the plane of the front wall is pertinent and most relevant to what is proposed in this case.
5. The proposal would not only unbalance the current symmetry of the paired dormer but would also remove the majority of roof surface which is an important design element of the street as a whole. Noting the appellant's reference to No.1 the Highlands, the significantly-widened dormer is less

impactful than what is proposed, because although the resultant dwelling pair are no longer equal in width, a semblance of symmetry remains in the wider, distant, street-scene as the doubled dormer sits against a widened building and expanded roof area. That not be the case for No.6.

6. Turning to the appellant's other representations; No 26 and No 11 The Highlands differ in architectural composition from the subject of this appeal. Whilst the approved extension does add accommodation to No.26 the characteristic 'M' roof outline of the paired bay is retained and the additional dormer is both subordinate and sits within a wider roof slope. In the case of No.1 the Highlands I note the alterations referred to were approved more than 30 years ago and, as is the case with works to No.25 which are less successful than the more recently approved proposal to its paired dwelling, I have had regard to these as contributing to the street scene but as these decisions were made in a different policy context they cannot reasonably apply as justification for what is proposed.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area in conflict with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 of the DMPLDD, thereby failing to accord with the Development Plan taken as a whole. Consequently, as my reasoning shows and taking all matters into account, the appeal does not succeed.

*Andrew Boughton*

INSPECTOR