



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/21/3280821
318 Vicarage Road, Watford WD18 6JG

- 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 N Ramzam against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00857/FULH, dated 4 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace house and forms part of a terrace of two storey houses, in a street in a residential area made up of similar terraced properties.
4. The proposal is for a first floor rear extension that would sit above a single storey rear extension that is currently under construction and would engage with a dormer roof extension that is also under construction. The proposed 'L' shaped extension would extend across the full width of the rear extension, with that part that would be approximately 1.95 metres deep having a flat roof and that part that would be approximately 2.98 metres deep having a pitched roof form
5. The proposed extension would add additional bulk to the host dwelling over and above that already under construction. This additional bulk would be visually in two distinct parts, massed under a combination of flat and pitched roof forms.
6. From my site visit it was apparent that although there are some first floor extensions evident in the area, none of these demonstrate a similar design to the proposal, or were in combination with significantly scaled dormer roof extensions. Generally, the houses in the area, including those to the rear of the appeal property, retain their original appearance and character to a significant degree.

7. Although the proposal would not be visible in street views from Vicarage Road, due to the land falling away to the rear of the appeal property, the appeal property has a prominent position in the local roofscape when seen from houses and private gardens to the rear of the property. From these viewpoints the proposal would result in an addition to the appeal property that would appear unduly bulky when considered in combination with the existing extensions. The proposed 'L' shape of the proposal and its roof forms would also result in the proposed additional bulk being massed in such a way that it would appear to add a cluttered form and roof profile, poorly integrated with the appeal property as already extended, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other approved extensions to properties nearby to the appeal site. I have considered this evidence and, whilst there are a few that have some similarities with the proposed extension, this would not alter the harm found with this proposal.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SS1 and UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Part 1-Core Strategy 2006-31 (2013), sections 8.2, 8.3 and 8.5 of the Watford Residential Design Guide 2014 (as amended 2016) and section 12 of the NPPF, which collectively seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, a key aspect of sustainable development, and are sympathetic to the host dwelling and local character.

Conclusion

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

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR