



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/W/23/3323672

141 Gladstone Road, Watford WD17 2RA

- 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 Kenny Nobbs against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00266/FULH, dated 24 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is second floor roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

Reasons

3. Gladstone Road is a residential street lined by characterful properties of mostly traditional design and appearance, often with well-articulated frontages and simple gable or hipped roof forms containing chimneys and other architectural detailing which add visual interest. Whilst the appeal property is one of the few detached houses in the street, it conforms with the general scale, massing, roof form, and traditional architectural detailing of the other buildings in the street, and so, contributes positively to the street scene and local distinctiveness of the area.
4. The proposal involves the construction of a new raised crowned hipped roof over the main house and rear outrigger. Although the vertical height increase would be fairly modest and would reflect the stepping down of properties in this part of the street, the overall scale and bulk of the upper part of the building would be significantly increased, and its shape and proportions would be fundamentally altered. The distinctive chimneys and traditional ridge and barge board detailing would also be lost. Overall, these alterations would not respect or compliment the original design and traditional character of the host building, thereby significantly harming its appearance.
5. Moreover, the full side elevation would be exposed to views from the north where the size and shape of the new crowned roof, including the appreciably steeper roof slopes and flat top in-between, would be markedly at odds with the prevailing character of regular gable and hipped roof forms, such that it would appear highly incongruous in the street scene. In this respect, the

proposal can be distinguished from the appeal decision at 201 Gammons Lane¹ where the Inspector described the street scene context as varied, including some existing crown roofs, and considered that the change in roof design would only be visible when passing the site.

6. For all these reasons, I find that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. This is contrary to Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan (2022); and sections 8.2, 8.3, and 8.11 of the Watford Residential Design Guide (as amended 2016). Amongst other things, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality design that respects and complements the size, shape and character of the host property and neighbouring buildings, including in respect of the roof form, and makes a positive contribution to the local character and identity of the area. It is also contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should be visually attractive, sympathetic to local character, and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

7. Although not specifically highlighted by the appellant, the proposal would create two additional bedspaces in a sustainable location close to town centre facilities and good public transport links. However, the limited benefits that would arise in this regard would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified and the resultant conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

8. Given the above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan 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.

A Caines

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal ref: APP/Y1945/D/22/3307848