
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2022

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/21/3288258
67 Nascot Wood Road, Watford WD17 4SJ

- 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 A Medari against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0110/FULH, dated 19 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension to create a first floor for the bungalow including a roof overhang and 2 No front roof lights and a ground floor side and part rear wrap around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's refusal notice and not from the planning application form as it more accurately describes what is shown on the submitted plans and reflects what was considered by the Council at planning application stage.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The Council do not raise an objection to the single storey wrap around extension. It would fail to comply with the requirement of paragraph 8.7d of the Council's Residential Design Guide 2016 (RDG) in so far that it would step forward of the front building line. However, this part of the development would not be visible from public vantage points given that the property is set well back from Nascot Wood Road and there are intervening walls, landscaping and gates. In this case, there is sufficient justification for overriding the technical conflict with paragraph 8.7d of the RDG. I do not therefore find that this part of the proposal, which would be relatively low in height, would be harmful in terms of its design or its effect on the character and appearance of the area.
5. The point of dispute between the main parties relates to the first floor roof extension which has already been built. While it is acknowledged that many of the other dwellings in the locality are two storey, they predominantly include

main pitched roofs. In contrast, the roof extension has a wide and significantly projecting shallow mono-pitch roof and including a large roof overhang.

6. When seen from Ridge Lane, the roof extension appears as a dominant and incongruous addition. I acknowledge that existing boundary hedging does to a large degree screen the side and rear of this property from the road. However, and even accounting for this vegetation, the roof is conspicuous when viewed from this main road. Furthermore, and, in any event, there can be no certainty that the boundary vegetation adjacent to the highway would not be cut back or at some point die, thereby opening up the site even more to passers-by.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that when the appeal development is considered as a whole, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, there is conflict with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies SS1 and UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2066-31 and sections 8.2 and 8.3 of the RDG.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to maximise floorspace for his growing family and that he is seeking to make efficient use of land. However, part of the appeal development is acceptable in planning terms and the evidence is that the Council would support some single storey development on the site. In this case, the appellant's desire to further increase floorspace does not outweigh the identified harm caused from the roof extension in design, character and appearance terms. This is a matter of overriding concern in the public interest.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not fully accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR