



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/19/3233053

49 Sussex Road, Watford, Herts WD24 5HL

- 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 & Mrs Peter & Dolores Chittenden against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00222/FULHH, dated 24 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with 2no. roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for a single storey rear extension with 2no. roof lights at 49 Sussex Road, Watford, Herts WD24 5HL in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 19/00022/FULHH dated 24 February 2019, 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: PL-49-1000 Revisions A, BP-4000, SLP-3000

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development proposed is taken from the appeal form in the interests of clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse on a residential street. It has previously been extended with a two-storey rear extension. The street is characterised by a variety of different styles of houses, typified by the neighbouring properties at Nos 47 and 51 both being of different character to the appeal property. Nos 47, 49 and 51 have rear elevations that align with one another, and which are the furthest to the rear of any house visible in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. No 47 is the first in a row of L-shaped terrace houses, the outriggers of which each project to the same depth. No 51 is a detached house, beyond which are visible semi-detached houses of varying rear elevation depth.

5. The proposed development would increase the depth of the appeal property, resulting in the deepest rear projection of any house in the immediate vicinity of the site. As such it would not comply with the 4 metre depth allowance established by the Council's adopted Residential Design Guide August 2016 (the Design Guide).
6. However, the Design Guide recognises that these are 'general rules', and that the impact on the existing property and neighbouring dwellings/buildings should be the principal consideration when determining the appropriate depth of an extension.
7. The proposed development would be a subordinate addition to the existing house. The cumulative effect of the existing and proposed extensions would not result in the disproportionate enlargement of the house, given their detailed design and the size of other houses in the immediate vicinity of the site. The rear gardens to the appeal site and its neighbours are large, and the proposed development would not result in overdevelopment of the plot. The Council has stated that the proposed development would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, and I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion.
8. The proposed development would therefore not be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and wider area. It complies with policies SS1 and UD1 of Watford's Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy 2006-31 January 2013 and guidance in the Design Guide. These policies, which taken together seek to ensure that proposed development protects residential amenity and protects and enhances the local character of the area in which it is located, are in accordance with the design approach of the National Planning Policy Framework, and there is therefore no conflict between local and national policy.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested standard conditions relating to time limit, materials and plans. I have included conditions relating to the commencement of development and confirmation of the approved plans for the sake of certainty. However, as matching external materials are specified on the approved plans, a separate condition securing this is not necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed, subject to the attached conditions.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR