



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025

by **C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/W/24/3348835

2 Briar Road, Kingswood, Watford, Hertfordshire WD25 0HN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Lisa Dunne against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00170/FULH.
 - The development proposed is described as “First floor side extension to existing first floor maisonette amended scheme roof height reduced hidden flat roof”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension to existing first floor maisonette at 2 Briar Road, Kingswood, Watford, Hertfordshire WD25 0HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00170/FULH, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: SHT No1 Existing floor plans and elevations; SHT No 2 Proposed floor plans and elevations; SHT No3 Proposed site plan, block plan and roof plan, and existing and proposed north-east elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have simplified the description in my decision above to remove superfluous words which are not acts of development.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2024. However, insofar as the contents are relevant to this appeal, the Framework has not changed. Therefore, I am satisfied no party would be disadvantaged by not having the opportunity to comment on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is residential, comprising rows of mainly semi-detached houses of traditional appearance on generally rectangular frontage plots. The host building is unusual in this context, because it has the appearance of a detached house and is set within a relatively larger plot by virtue of its location on a bend in Briar Road. The building's traditional style and materials complement the character of the street, however.
6. The proposed first floor extension would be located above the front part of the host building's existing single storey side extension. When viewed from the street, the new extension's dimensions, set-back from the principal frontage and window design would mirror those of the existing addition. The height and form of the proposed roof would complement and be clearly subordinate to the host building's principal hipped roof. In addition, the proportions and pitch of the perimeter of the new roof would be comparable to those of the existing extension's roof, integrating well when viewed from the rear. Matching materials would further integrate the appearance of the extension and could be secured by condition were the appeal to be allowed.
7. I therefore find the proposed extension would respect the character of the host building in its form, roof design, fenestration and materials. Although its width would exceed half that of the main building, it would be no wider than the existing side extension. The resulting structure would be seen as a two-storey extension of subordinate scale in the context of the house's detached appearance and larger plot, and for the reasons noted above. The proposal would also complement the traditional appearance and proportions of neighbouring buildings, so would not look out of place in the street. Consequently, I find no conflict with sections 8.2, 8.3, 8.6 and 8.8 of the Watford Residential Design Guide, which require particular care in the design of side extensions given their prominence in the street scene.
8. On the evidence before me, the roof of the appeal scheme would be materially lower than that proposed in previous refused application Ref 22/00860/FULH. This change in design contributes to the subordinate scale of the proposed extension relative to the host dwelling, which I have found to be acceptable.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Watford Local Plan Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4, which require scale and massing that relate to the local context and materials that sit comfortably with buildings in the area. I also find no conflict with the Framework, where it seeks good design that is sympathetic to local character while not discouraging appropriate change.

Other Matters

10. I have considered the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, particularly 1 and 7 Kingswood Road. These properties are situated behind the appeal site, separated from it by an intervening service road. The proposed extension would be towards the front of the appeal site, adding further to the separation between the proposed development and these dwellings. In addition, the extension would be positioned at an oblique angle to the Kingswood Road houses due to the curve in Briar Road. These factors satisfy me that neither the risk of overlooking from the new extension nor the

change in outlook for neighbouring occupiers would be so great as to be materially harmful. There is no pertinent evidence the proposal would have a detrimental effect on light to neighbouring rooms or gardens.

11. There is little to substantiate the suggestion the development would increase demand for on-street parking, so concerns about highway safety do not justify withholding permission. Any effects during the construction period would be short-term and could be mitigated by careful construction management. Planning permission would not override any legal rights of access.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. The condition to secure matching materials is necessary for the reason given above.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons the proposal accords with the development plan, read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed.

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR