



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/24/3339464

67 Greenfield Avenue, Carpenders Park, Watford, Hertfordshire, WD19 5DJ

- 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 V Dabhi against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/2070/FUL, dated 1 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is construction of front porch extension; single storey rear extension; loft conversion including hip to gable roof extension, front and side dormers with windows with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 67 Greenfield Avenue is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof located in an established residential area. There are bungalows of a similar form, both detached and semi-detached along the street, set back from the road on both sides along a regular building line. Some have been extended and there are a few examples with dormer windows at the front.
4. The relevant policies in this case include policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013). These relate to design and the quality of the built environment and, among other things, set out that extensions should respect the existing character of the building and the local context, not lead to a gradual deterioration in the quality of the environment and not be excessively prominent in the street scene.
5. Planning permission was granted in 2023 for a single storey rear extension with a flat roof, approximately 7m deep and the full width of the building. It was permitted in the context of deep rear extensions to the properties on either side. It has not been implemented. A Certificate of Lawfulness Proposed Development for a loft conversion including alterations to roof form with rear dormer window and front rooflights was approved in 2023.

6. The proposed single storey rear extension would have the same footprint as the permitted extension and include an alteration to the hipped roof of the existing bungalow to form a gable roof over it. It would extend along the shared boundary with No. 69 and be set approximately 3.3m from the boundary with No. 65. I consider that the proposed gable roof would be excessive in scale compared with the permitted flat roof rear extension. Although the bulk of the new roof would be towards the rear, the spacing between the individual bungalows, particularly at roof level where the hipped form of the roofs allows for spacious sky views, is such that the long flank elevations would be more visible than the permitted extension and would appear out of scale with the bungalow itself, and with the predominant pattern of development along the street.
7. I consider that the four proposed dormers would be excessive both in scale and bulk, and due to their siting on both sides of the proposed extended roof would not respect the character of the existing bungalow. Although they would be subordinate to the new roof, that roof itself would be out of proportion with the existing bungalow because of its excessive size. They would appear as prominent, incongruous features in views along the street, particularly from the east because of the rising land levels from east to west.
8. I have taken account of the fallback position based on the permitted single storey extension and the rear dormer which could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, the flat roof of the extension and its location between extensions at the neighbouring properties mean that it would not be visible from public views and although the rear dormer would not necessarily make a positive contribution to the appearance of the bungalow it would be less bulky than the appeal proposal.
9. I have also taken account of the examples where roofs have been extended in other properties along the street. These appear different in detail and size, with some, including that at No. 69, having a hipped roof to the rear rather than a gable. The dormers at No. 75 are set back from the front hip but still appear very prominent and bulky and I consider that they are not an appropriate example to follow.
10. The design and splayed appearance of the proposed front porch would detract somewhat from the appearance of the bay windows on either side. However, it would be relatively modest in size and would not appear out of keeping in the context of the variety of other front porches along the street.
11. I consider that overall, the excessive scale, bulk and mass of the proposed gable roof extension and four dormers would result in a form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the bungalow itself and the street scene.
12. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the bungalow and the wider area, contrary to policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and DM1 and Appendix 2 of the DMPLDD.
13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR