



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/22/3307848

201 Gammons Lane, Watford, Hertfordshire WD24 5JJ

- 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 Zoreen Fatima against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00904/FULH, dated 14 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of loft conversion with raised roof including front and side roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of loft conversion with raised roof including front and side roof lights at 201 Gammons Lane, Watford, Hertfordshire WD24 5JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00904/FULH, dated 14 July 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location Plan, Existing Plans & Elevations No. 1, Proposed Plans & Elevations No. 2, Proposed Floor & Roof Plans No. 3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.
3. Since the determination of the application the Council has adopted the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038 (October 2022) (LP). The Council has advised that Policy UD1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2031 has now been replaced by Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the LP.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey detached property with a gabled tiled pitched roof and a two storey outrigger at the rear. It is located in a mature well-established residential area, with a mixture of properties of varied styles and design set back from the road in a staggered built frontage.
6. The surrounding two storey properties have gabled and hipped roofs, but with some crowned roofs and variation in eaves and ridge heights, which provides a varied context and roofscape in the immediate surroundings. The proposal would involve the construction of a loft conversion with a new raised crowned hipped tiled roof with rooflights over the main house and the outrigger, with an eaves and ridge height set slightly above the adjacent properties.
7. Given the site's location, the proposed roof extension and the change in the roof design, would only be visible over short distances when passing the site. It would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles of the existing properties and roofscape in the immediate surroundings.
8. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the roof extension, set back within the staggered built frontage, would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The modest scale and overall design of the roof extension, together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property and would not significantly detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with the overall aims of Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the LP and the Council's Residential Design Guide 2016. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development and residential extensions are of a high quality design that complement the host property, relate well to the local context and make a positive contribution towards the local character and identity of the area.
10. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 56, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR