
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/20/3250093

4 Kildonan Close, Watford WD17 4LH

- 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 Geoff Middleton against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00067/FULH, dated 18 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a double storey front extension and changes to the fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property at No. 4 Kildonan Close (No. 4) is a two storey detached dwelling located in a mature well-established residential cul-de-sac. It is typically characterised by large detached properties set back from the road in relatively spacious landscaped plots, that provides an open and verdant character in the area. Although there is some variation in the design and style of the other properties in the cul-de-sac, Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5 have similar features with facing brickworks, tiled roofs and projecting gables.
4. The appeal site has an extensive planning history, including an application allowed on appeal for a two storey front extension in 2016¹. The proposal would entail the construction of a two storey extension that would project out in front of the existing gabled extension on the front of the property. It would be constructed predominantly in brick with a hipped pitched tiled roof in line with the ridge of the main house. The proposal would also involve a linked single storey entrance extension at the front of the house.
5. The front of the proposed extension would be generally in line with the building line of Nos. 1 and 3 and the use of wider windows with a vertical emphasis is not a unique feature within this residential cul-de-sac, as noted

¹ 19/00308/FULH

by the Inspector on the previously approved scheme. The scale and form of the proposed staggered front extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. The proposed front extension, combined with the front gabled extension and the hipped roof over the proposed extension, would result in substantial bulk on this side of the dwelling that would be out of character with the generally more modest front extensions and distinctive projecting gables in this particular location.

6. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's position, in close proximity to the front boundary, where it would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Kildonan Close. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would compromise the sense of space and openness in the area. As such, I consider that the proposed extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.
7. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed extension have been carefully considered in order to minimise any adverse impacts on the host property and the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to the overall aims of Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 and the Council's Residential Design Guide 2016. This policy and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development and residential extensions are of a high quality design that complement the host property and respect and enhance the local character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the residential development along Kildonan Close is of a different scale and form to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and this does not set a precedent for such an inappropriate development in this location for the reasons set out above.
10. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR