
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: 1st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/21/3284330

316 and 318 Vicarage Road, Watford, Hertfordshire 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 Mrs Najma Ramzan against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01200/FULH, dated 4 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a front and side extension for properties 316 Vicarage Road and 318 Vicarage Road, to be considered as a joint application.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front and side extension at 316 and 318 Vicarage Road, Watford, Hertfordshire WD18 6JG in accordance with the terms of application reference 21/01200/FULH, dated 4 August 2021 and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: TM1-Existing, TM4 V2, P2, SP1
 2. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the host dwellings.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Vicarage Road is characterised by a mixture of mid-20th century terraced and semi-detached dwellings, many of which benefit from single storey front extensions and porches. The front extension proposed would have a simple pitched roof form and be of a similar depth to these existing extensions.
4. The proposed front structure would be relatively wide, spanning part of the front elevation of both properties. However, given its limited depth in this location, it would not detract from or appear overly prominent in the context of the host properties or the streetscene. Indeed, the front extension would add interest to the front elevations of these properties.

5. Whilst the extension would join the two houses, I note that there is already a physical ground floor link between the dwellings in the form of a wall with inset gates. I recognise that the proposed structure would be slightly higher than the current arrangement and extend forward of the existing properties. However, adequate separation at first floor level would be retained to allow the dwellings to still be read as separate houses belonging to separate terraces.
6. Taking into account all of the above, the appeal proposal would not undermine the existing development pattern or appear overly dominant within the context of the existing dwellings or the street scene. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwellings and surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies SS1 and 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 house extensions to secure a high standard of design which respects the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area.

Conditions

7. I attach conditions in relation to timescales and setting out the approved plans to provide certainty. A condition regarding materials will safeguard the character and appearance of the host dwellings and area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, I conclude the appeal should be allowed

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR