



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/21/3279848

Strathtay, 2a Alexandra Road, Watford WD17 4QY

- 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 Roman Iscenko against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00722/FULH, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension at Strathtay, 2a Alexandra Road, Watford WD17 4QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00722/FULH, dated 12 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The host property is a detached dwelling on an irregular shaped plot widening to the rear, located in a residential area made up of properties of a variety of scale and design. The dwelling has been the subject of planning approvals for a loft extension, an extensive two storey rear extension and a single storey side extension, which, it would appear from my site visit are nearing completion.
4. The proposal is for a single storey flat roofed side and rear extension that would engage with the existing single side extension, aligning with the side boundary to the neighbouring property and aligning and projecting from the

flank wall of the two storey rear extension. This would result in the proposed extension widening out towards its rearmost part. The proposed extension would continue the flank wall of the existing side extension by approximately 6.5 metres and would project rearward to the side of the existing rear extension, with its rear wall being parallel with the line of the rear wall of the existing rear extension.

5. The Watford Residential Design Guide 2014 (as amended 2016) (the SPD) sets out that extensions should be parallel to the side wall of the existing house even where a boundary wall is at an angle to the house, which is the case with the appeal plot. The Design Guide also sets out that rear extensions should not extend more than 4 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling. Watford Borough Council (the Council) has calculated the projection of existing and proposed side extensions would be 14 metres, based on the cumulative length of the proposed and existing side extensions.
6. I find, however, that, as the position of the proposal would place it mostly to the side and not to the rear of the existing dwelling, it would project approximately 2.5 metres from its existing rear wall. Thereby resulting in a cumulative projection of proposed and existing rear extensions of approximately 6.5 metres from the original rear wall of the appeal dwelling.
7. The Council's Design Guidance is advice that should be considered along with the individual circumstances. In this case the proposed extension would not be visible from the public realm and would only be visible from the rear of adjoining properties.
8. Further, whilst the proposal would not be orthogonal in plan, it would reflect the boundary relationship between the appeal plot and that of its adjoining neighbour and the angle of the flank wall of the existing side extension, resulting in a balanced visual relationship between the two properties when viewed from the neighbouring property. Although the proposal would project further from the rear wall than that advised in the design guidance, when viewed from the properties to the rear and opposite side of the dwelling to the proposal, it would appear as being in a significant orthogonal visual relationship with the host dwelling.
9. The host dwelling has been the subject of a significant degree of alteration and extension, these are, however, fundamentally to the rear of the property. I find, therefore, that the proposal would not, cumulatively with the existing extensions, appear as an overly dominant addition to the host dwelling, but would appear as subservient additions that would sit comfortably on the appeal plot, without significantly reducing the extent of the rear garden.
10. Whilst the proposal is not in full accordance with the guidance set out in paragraphs 8.1, 8.2, 8.5 and 8.7 of the SPD, I find that it would not, when considering the pertaining circumstances and for the reasons set out above, result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal would not, therefore, be in conflict with Policies SS1 and UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Part 1-Core Strategy 2006-31 (2013) and section 12 of the NPPF, which collectively seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, a key aspect of sustainable development. In this regard I

have, along with the standard conditions on implementation attached a condition to ensure that the materials used match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR