



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2022

**By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**  
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 27th July 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/22/3293180**  
**54 Kings Avenue Watford WD18 7SA**

- 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 M Shabir against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref: 21/01506/FULH dated 11 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
  - The development proposed is a loft conversion with L shaped dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter:

2. It is not disputed, and from my own visit apparent, that the loft conversion with a rear roof dormer extension has been constructed and that the appellant is seeking permission retrospectively. Accordingly I shall determine the appeal on this basis.

### Main Issues:

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

### Reasons

4. The appeal property consists of a two storey terraced dwelling with a conventional layout of front and rear facing principal rooms (two per floor) on ground and upper storey with a two-storey outrigger at the rear. The building has already been extended at the rear and has a loft conversion incorporating an L-shaped dormer roof extension at the rear. It is the latter work for which permission is sought.
5. The property is located in an established residential area dominated by terraced housing. Although properties have been extended or otherwise altered, and a more recent block of flats sits nearby on the same side of the street, there is broad consistency of scale and appearance as far as the terrace blocks are concerned in the immediate locality. These largely retain a characteristic pitched roof forms of transverse ridge with intersecting outriggers whereas in other sections of similar housing, those with roof extensions predominate.

6. The ridge height resulting from the loft conversion is higher than its neighbour but this is not unduly prominent in the street scene due to the intervening parapets and the context of other variations in height. However, this limited impact does not mitigate the effect of the works at the rear. An L-shaped flat-roof dormer extends from this ridge leaving only an outer portion of the original outrigger pitched roof. The result, accentuated by the increased ridge height, is an unacceptably obtrusive and top-heavy built form which breaches the skyline from certain viewpoints at the rear and fails to respect the original building form or those of its neighbours.
7. Both parties refer to nearby appeal decisions which point to their respective positions.<sup>1</sup> To my mind the appeal at 89 Princes Avenue, which succeeded in part allowing the retention of works to the rear of the main roof area has less contextual equivalence than that of Whippendell Road. The development is conspicuously alien to the characteristic pitch roof forms which prevail.
8. Whilst I note the use of similar materials and the comments of the appellant as to permitted development and other roof extensions in the area, there is nothing before me that argues a fallback position, or accordance with, rights granted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. I note the reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework), however the case has not been made that the policies referred to in the Council's decision are inconsistent with the Framework.
9. The overall aims of Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2013 and the Council's Residential Design Guide 2016 (Section 8.12), amongst other things, seek to ensure that development and residential extensions are of a high quality design that complement the host property and respect and enhance the local character of the area. I conclude, as my reasons explain, that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area in conflict with the objectives of these policies, also that the development does not accord with the Framework and its pursuit of high quality design.
10. Consequently, the proposal would not accord with the development plan taken as a whole and, taking all matters into account, it follows that the appeal must fail.

*Andrew Boughton*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Decision APP/Y1945/C/19/3227269: 89 Princes Avenue Watford (17 January 2020) and APP/Y1945/C/19/3225038:324 Whippendell Road Watford (14 July 2021);