
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/21/3283334

43 Royal Court, Queen Marys Avenue, Watford WD18 7JN

- 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 and Mrs Hamid against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00831/FULH, dated 28 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft space to form habitable room, incorporating rear dormer window, with Velux and 2 No. Velux roof lights to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Whilst the proposed dormer roof extension would sit below the ridge height of the existing roof, it would span almost the full extent of the rear roof plane of the existing dwelling. On this basis, the proposal would be a visually dominant and excessively bulky feature which would be overly prominent in the context of the host dwelling. Whilst it would not be visible from the public realm, it would be visible from the gardens of a number of nearby dwellings. The proposal would therefore unacceptably harm the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the area.
4. I note that other properties in Royal Court include dormers but these appear to be original features. Those structures are significantly less bulky than the appeal proposal and their scale responds well to the context of those dwellings.
5. I have also considered examples of other dormer roof extensions which the appellants have submitted in support of their proposals. However, based on the limited information before me, the circumstances of these structures vary from the appeal proposal.
6. I acknowledge that there are examples of dormer roof extensions of a similar scale and form to the appeal proposal in the wider area. However, these are extensions to semi-detached houses. Also, the appellants advise these have

been constructed under permitted development rights, whereas permitted development rights have been withdrawn from the appeal property.

7. I also note that a dormer roof extension at Hare Crescent was allowed at appeal. However, that property is a semi-detached property in a wide plot with a large roof area to accommodate the dormer. By comparison, the appeal proposal is a terraced house with a relatively narrow plot. Also, the Inspector states that there are other examples of similar dormers in public view in the vicinity.
8. In view of the above, I attached limited weight to these other examples of dormers in support of the appeal proposal. That aside, each proposal must be considered on its own merit.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy UD1 of the Watford's Local Plan, Part One Core Strategy (2013) and the provisions of the Watford Residential Design Guide SPD (2016) which, taken together, require proposals to secure a high standard of design which respects the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR