
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2023

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/23/3322778

27 Maude Crescent, Watford, Hertfordshire WD24 6DE

- 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 Syed Kazmi against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00140/FUL, dated 19 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor extension at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace house that addresses Maude Crescent within a predominantly residential area. Like some properties close to the site, No 27 has been externally altered and extended. A large flat roof dormer has been placed onto the rear roof slope of No 27. At ground floor level, there is a flat roof rear addition that extends across almost the full width of the host building. The site is not within a conservation area.
4. The proposal is a first-floor rear addition that would be set back from the sides and rear of the ground floor projection below. The new addition would be modest in scale with an eaves level that would align with that of the host building. That the proposed external materials would match the existing dwelling would unify its general appearance with the remainder of the building.
5. Nevertheless, the appeal scheme would add further to the scale and bulk of the built form at the rear of No 27. It would be seen along with the sizeable ground floor and dormer extensions, with the new hipped roof projecting noticeably above the base of the existing dormer, creating an uneasy overlap between them. There would also be an awkward juxtaposition of different rooflines in the new rear elevation with hipped and flat roofs close together and the roof slope of the proposal at a shallower pitch than that of the main house.
6. When seen together, the proposed and existing rear extensions would result in a cumbersome enlargement of the appeal dwelling. In the light of the cumulative impact on the appeal dwelling, the proposal would form an unwieldy

and prominent feature in the new rear façade. Although the new extension would not be visible from the road or other public vantage points, it would be readily evident from the back gardens of the properties on either side of the site. From these vantage points, the proposal would draw the eye as an obtrusive and unwelcome addition to both the host building and the local area.

7. The Council's Residential Design Guide (RDG) advises that extensions must respect the character and scale of the host building. To achieve this outcome, the RDG states that extensions should normally be subordinate to the host building and in harmony with its size, shape and roof pitch. As the proposal would not do so, it would conflict with this guidance.
8. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it is contrary to Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038 and the RDG. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development achieves high quality design and positively contributes to the local area. It is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall qualities of the area.
9. Interested parties raise several additional objections including its effect on the living conditions of others. These are important matters and I have considered all the evidence before me. However, given my findings on the main issue, my decision has not turned on these matters.

Conclusion

10. Overall, the development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the policies of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan.
11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR