
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by E Maund BA (Hons) MSc Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/19/3242620
59 Balmoral Road, Watford WD24 4ES

- 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 Dritan Berisha against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01001/FULH, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the Erection of double and single storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 59 Balmoral Road is a semi-detached property located at the north west corner of the junction between Southfield Avenue, Imperial Way and Balmoral Road. The land rises from the junction in a northerly direction, such that when viewed from the south, the properties on the western side of Southfield Avenue form a strong linear feature along a regular building line beyond the appeal site.
4. The appeal property is prominent from the east and west, but particularly when travelling down the hill from the north.
5. The appeal scheme would extend the building significantly and being sited on this prominent corner would be particularly noticeable from public vantage points. The combination of the rear and side two storey extension with gable would introduce a bulky extension which would be dominant and visually prominent.
6. Both main parties agree that the dormer that has been added to the original property has created an ugly addition. The appellant, however, considers that by adding the new extension this will mask this element and improve the general appearance of the property. Whilst I agree that the scheme will screen the existing dormer to a certain extent, it will not obscure it entirely and in any

- event the scheme before me adds a series of additions which when combined with the existing will result in bulky and prominent additions in their own right.
7. Whilst the extension has been set back from the front, this being a corner plot is viewed from several vantage points and the relative reduction from this elevation does not ameliorate the effect of the scale of the scheme from each of these other viewpoints.
 8. Despite the use of sympathetic materials, the bulk of the proposal and the combination of the side and rear extensions wrapping round the current property would form an incongruous addition. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish the character and appearance of the host dwelling consequently harming the character and appearance of the local area.
 9. The appeal scheme would therefore be contrary to the objectives of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy Policy UD1 and the principles of good design promoted in the Residential Design Guide.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to several properties in the vicinity that have been extended, however, I am not aware of the full circumstances in those cases and I must in any event consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. The existence of other extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Edwin Maund

INSPECTOR