



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/25/3371762

12 Blacketts Wood Drive, Chorleywood, Rickmansworth WD3 5QH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Devean George against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/0565/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension; first floor rear extension; front extension; existing tiled cladding replaced with white render matching No. 10 and alterations to the fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension; first floor rear extension; front extension; existing tiled cladding replaced with white render matching No. 10 and alterations to the fenestration at 12 Blacketts Wood Drive, Chorleywood, Rickmansworth in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 25/0565/FUL and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. Series BW-R00-EX: Plan Nos. 102; 103; 104; 105 (No Revisions); Drawing No. Series BW-R00-PR: Plan Nos. 101; 102; 103; 104; 105; 106; (No Revisions);
 - 3) Other than as specified on the approved plans, all works or making good to the retained fabric shall be finished in size, colour, texture and profile those of the existing building;
 - 4) The flat roof of the existing storey rear extension shall not be used other than in connection with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal scheme is for several alterations and additions to the host dwelling, but as indicated in the Notice of Refusal the Council identifies two main areas of concern that would be harmful in terms of the main issue.
4. Firstly, the proposed dormer would to all intents and purposes occupy the entire extent of the rear roof plane and I agree with the Officers' report that the size and design of this addition is in conflict with Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Council's Development Management Policies: Local Development Document 2013 ('the Local Plan') and also with paragraph 139 of Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024 ('the Framework'). However, as the Report itself acknowledges, this roof extension has already been approved as 'permitted development' under application reference 24/1039/CLPD and indeed at the time of my visit was in place.
5. Secondly, the Council's case for refusal refers to the two-storey rear extension, which following the refusal of application Ref. 25/0029/FUL has now been reduced by 2.5m in width to 5m and with a gabled roof. The Report accepts that in principle there is no objection to this addition in its revised form but argues that when read with the dormer there would be '*significant elevated bulk and massing that would overwhelm the rear of the dwelling*'.
6. I understand the point being made but from my reading of the submitted plans, in particular Drawing No. PR-104, I am minded to draw a different conclusion. The proposed gable would draw the eye away from the over-scaled and poorly designed dormer and indeed in some views obscure part of it. Furthermore, as the middle element in the sequential step down of the extensions from the dormer to the ground floor extension, the gable with its contrasting design would provide visual relief from the rectilinear form of the two other extensions.
7. I acknowledge that the cumulative bulk and massing of the rearward additions would be significant, but I also consider that the reduced-width two storey rear extension would reduce the dominance and 'top heavy' visual impact of the dormer. And with the ground floor addition also of reasonable proportions, the step down would provide a degree of visual coherence to the design of the rear elevation. On this basis I take the view that the combination of the two storey extension and the dormer would be an improvement on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings compared with the alternative of the dormer on its own.
8. I have also considered that the rear of No. 12 is not part of the street scene and that with the long and verdant rear gardens of the site and its neighbours even private views of the rear elevation are very limited. Furthermore, the grounds of appeal cite include photographs of large rear extensions at neighbouring properties and these are indicative of the area's existing character and appearance.
9. Overall, and bearing in mind that the dormer is permitted development, I find that the appeal proposal would not be in unacceptable conflict with either the Local Plan or the Framework and thereby no harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings. In coming to this view, I have also had regard to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Three Rivers DC Core Strategy 2011 and Policy 2 of the Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum Version) 2020.

10. The appeal therefore succeeds. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. An external materials condition will help the extensions to harmonise with the existing building and preserve visual amenity. Finally, a condition restricting the use of the roof of the single storey rear extension will safeguard the privacy of neighbours,

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR