



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/22/3290035

1 North Approach, Watford WD25 0EH

- 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 Jane Winn against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01272/FULH dated 19 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is side extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed side extension and porch at 1 North Approach, Watford WD25 0EH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01272/FULH dated 19 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development for the development, contained within the application form, I have reworded the description to clearly describe the proposal.
3. At the time of my site visit, the development was in place. The application form made clear that the scheme had been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the appeal property.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated in a row of semi-detached properties, whilst many properties have been extended or altered there is a uniformity in the building line. The appeal site is located on a corner plot, close to a busy junction.
6. The Watford Borough Council, Residential Design Guide (2016) contains guidance in relation to new development and confirms that side extensions should be set back at last 1m from the principal building line to avoid a 'terracing effect'. The development does not have a 1m set back projecting forward of the appeal property and wrapping around the front of the property, connecting a porch to the side extension.

7. Notwithstanding this due to the orientation of the existing building on the plot along with the gap between the shared boundary the development would retain the prevailing semi-detached character of the area, avoiding a continuous façade or 'terracing effect'.
8. A number of properties in the immediate area have porches of varying designs and side extensions without a set back were also visible in the area.
9. Whilst the development projects forward of the building line, it is modest in scale, not incongruous in the streetscene and does not dominate the appeal property.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area nor the appeal property. There is no conflict with Policies SS1 and UD1 of the Watford Local Plan, Part 1 – Core Strategy 2006-31 (2013) which seek amongst other things to ensure development is of high standard of design responding positively to the character of an area.
11. There is also no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
13. Conditions relating to standard time limit for commencement of development, plans to be adhered to and materials to be used are not relevant or necessary as the development is complete.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR