



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2019

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/19/3235969

2 Aurora Close, Watford WD25 0NF

- 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 Gerald Yeo against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00480/FULH, dated 29 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey conservatory at the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, No 2 Aurora Close, is a three storey, semi-detached dwelling situated on a residential road. The dwelling has an existing rear projection with a tiled mono pitched roof which covers a significant proportion of the rear elevation. The projection contains a pair of patio doors and the rear elevation of the dwelling contains a small rear window which appears to serve the kitchen area.
4. The proposal is to construct a conservatory at the rear of the dwelling which, together with the existing projection, would have the effect of creating an "L-shaped" projection from the building with a cut-away section between the rear elevation and proposed conservatory. The conservatory would be constructed of white PVCu with matching brickwork. The roof would be double hipped and constructed of PVCu and glass.
5. Due to the design of the proposal, particularly the width which gives rise to the cut-away section, the proposed conservatory would appear as an incongruous addition to the dwelling which would not respect the proportions or built form of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the roof form of the proposed conservatory would be at odds with that of the host dwelling and would create a mixture of roof forms which would not complement each other.
6. Whilst the proposal would not be readily visible from the public realm it would be visible from some neighbouring properties and glimpse views from a nearby

public footpath would also be possible. This somewhat limited visibility would not mitigate the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

7. For the reasons set out above, the proposed conservatory would sit uncomfortably with the host dwelling and would appear as a visually jarring addition which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I note that the Residential Design Guide, adopted in July 2014 and amended in August 2016 (SPG) does not rule out roof forms that do not match the host property and that the proposed extension's depth would only marginally exceed what is recommended. However, there would be a breach of the guidelines and, for the reasons given, the scheme would be unacceptable. Therefore, in addition to the conflict with the SPG, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy UD1 of Watford's Local Plan, Part 1 - Core Strategy 2006 – 31, adopted January 2013. This policy seeks to secure high quality design that respects and enhances the local character of the built environment.
9. The proposal would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes good design which is visually attractive and sympathetic to the character of the area.

Other Matters

10. I recognise that if permitted development rights were in place an extension of a similar size could be constructed without the need for express planning permission. However, in this case those rights have been removed and no such extension could be constructed thus removing any potential fallback position.
11. I note the absence of harm to the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings in respect of their living conditions. The absence of harm is, however, neutral and adds weight neither for nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the appeal should fail.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR