



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2023

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1910/D/23/3319937

3 Chiltern Villas, Aylesbury Road, Tring HP23 4DH

- 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 Mrs Gillian Wells against the decision of Decorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/03586/FHA dated 1 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2023.
 - The application is for demolition of single storey rear extension. Construction of single storey rear extension and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Tring Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi detached house build around 1905. As such it exhibits several architectural elements associated with Edwardian Architecture of the time including brick and render materials and some Mock Tudor details. Chiltern Villa's itself, being a short street overlooking the landscape to the front appears significant due to its overall character and appearance defined by similar materials, architectural details and motifs. I consider it likely therefore that these characteristics were key considerations in including the appeal property within the Tring Conservation Area.
4. The Conservation Area therefore encompasses this area of the town that is defined largely by terrace houses and more polite, higher status early suburban type properties such as those exhibited along Chiltern Villas. The contribution of the appeal property to this character is both through its architectural expression and the overriding historic character that it forms part of. Therefore part of this significance is obtained through views to the rear of the property from Longfield Road where the rear outshot, chimneys and roof form can be clearly seen.
5. To the property itself there currently exists a rear gable extension that was likely original, along with a smaller, likely later single storey extension at

ground floor level. The presence of velux type windows confirms the presence of an existing room within the roof space.

6. The proposal before me seeks to remove the smaller scale single storey rear extension and to rebuild a slightly larger structure in its place that would seem to echo a similar extension to the immediate neighbours house. This would contain a conical roof form and bifold doors giving access to the rear garden. To the roof of the house is proposed a dormer window type construction clad in slate type cladding with aluminium fenestration. This proposed dormer would sit fairly close to the eaves line and attempt to relive its massing through the use of partial pitched roof elements.
7. In assessing this appeal I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to give 'Special Attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Tring Conservation Area. This is reflected in The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework), which states that 'Great Weight' should be given to the assets' conservation and illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities.
8. Further to this Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) as well as those saved policies within the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan 1991-2011 also seek to ensure proposals are of a high quality design and preserve or enhance the context to which development is being proposed and that they are complimentary to the historic environment.
9. In assessing the single storey rear extension, I consider that it represents a sound response to both the character of the original property and the wider Conservation Area through its modest scale and fusion of traditional and modern design aesthetics. As such this element of the proposal would not appear to give rise to any specific harm to the historic environment.
10. However, the proposed dormer extension, whilst attempting very hard to mitigate its scale and bulk, ultimately results in a contrived form of development that I consider would be harmful to the Conservation Area. This is largely due to the overall scale and massing of the proposed dormer window as well as its contrived design that I do not believe effectively mitigates this bulk and massing.
11. Such an extension therefore would appear overly bulky and is not successful in its attempt to alleviate the appearance of what is still effectively a large box dormer through the integration of partial pitched roof elements. Although I saw on my site visit that there are other large dormers within the streetscene I do not know the precise reasons as to why these were constructed and I consider that following their example would not help preserve or enhance the character of the area.
12. Ultimately, although I give weight to the practical reasons for needing to gain better stair access into the loft space, the proposal before me would result in an overly dominant dormer extension that would not only dominate the roof form and chimneys but would have a harmful impact upon the wider character and appearance of the area, most specifically when the rear of the property is seen from Longfield Road.

13. As such I consider that the proposal before me would be in conflict with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) as well as those saved policies within the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan 1991-2011 as well as the aspirations for good design as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR