



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/24/3342523

4 Penrose Avenue, Carpenders Park, Hertfordshire, WD19 5AD

- 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 S Patel against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref 24/0207/FUL, dated 7 February 2024, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2024.
 - The development proposed is single storey side to rear extension, front porch, side to rear roof extension, side and rear roof dormer and roof lights installation.
-

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. 4 Penrose Avenue is a detached bungalow in an established residential area. It occupies a prominent position on a bend in the road and is clearly visible along the street particularly on the approach from the north. The immediate surroundings are characterised by bungalows, originally of simple form with hipped roofs and traditional materials.
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. Crown roofs are discouraged since they can result in inappropriate bulk and massing.
5. Although the proposal would not involve an increase in the height of the main ridge, it would result in an excessive increase in the size and volume of the bungalow. This would not respect the character of the existing building, particularly because of the introduction of a crown roof in combination with the proposed flat roofed dormer windows.

6. I note that Prior Approval has been given for an 8 metre single storey flat roofed extension to the rear and that this is a realistic fallback position. I consider that a single storey side extension would be acceptable in the context of the ample garden space available to the east. However, the cumulative effect of the proposal as a whole with the large crown roof and two flat roofed dormers inserted into the new enlarged roof would result in an increase in bulk and massing which would be inappropriate in the context of the surrounding bungalows.
7. I have taken account of the many bungalows in the surrounding area which have been altered and extended in a variety of ways, including with dormer windows and hipped to gable roof forms. These have diluted the prevailing architectural character of the area with mixed results in terms of the extent to which they make a positive contribution to the visual amenities of the area. Many were likely to have been constructed under permitted development rights and do not necessarily amount to good examples to follow.
8. There is a small number of extensions involving crown roofs in the wider area, including at No. 1 Penrose Avenue. I have limited information regarding the circumstances in which these were permitted, but in the case of No. 1 this appears to have been before the adoption of Appendix 2 of the DMPLDD. In the case of the development at 123 Greenfield Avenue, it involved demolition of the previous bungalow and a new build and the topography and relationship between neighbouring properties was different. On balance, I consider that the form, bulk and massing of crown roofs do not make a positive contribution to the general street scene and are not suitable examples to follow in this case.
9. I consider that overall, the excessive scale, bulk and mass of the proposed extension with its crown roof and two dormers, together with its prominent position in views along the street, would result in a form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the bungalow itself and the street scene.
10. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the bungalow itself and the wider area, contrary to policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and DM1 and Appendix 2 of the DMPLDD.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR