



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by A Phillips MPlan, BA, CertHE and MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/24/3354204

12A, Rhodes House, Rose Gardens, Watford, Herts WD18 0JB

- 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 Mr Stuart Taylor against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00652/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Proposed Roof Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged there has been an updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, I am satisfied there are no implications for the main issue for this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the area and site.

Reasons

4. Rose Gardens is a cul-de-sac defined by semi-detached dwellings. These dwellings are constructed out of a mixture of bricks and render styles. A few of these properties have had publicly viewable side extensions, though no dormers as referred to in a supporting letter were seen from the street. However, the overall original form of the semi-detached properties remains a strong defining characteristic of this street scene. The uniformity of the eaves and ridge lines of these dwellings are part of what creates a sense of character on this street.
5. 12A (also known as Rhodes House) is the only detached dwelling on this street and is built entirely from brick. While this property is an anomaly within the street it sits comfortably within the street scene due to its design, materials, ridge height eaves high and roof pitch. The ridge height of No.12A appears to be the same as the adjacent semi-detached dwellings on either side.
6. Given the uniformity of the ridge heights within the street, the raising of the ridge height by approximately 1m and the creation a mansard roof would look out of keeping within this street. In addition to this it would add a significant amount of bulk to the roof structure that makes the roof both a more dominant feature in the street and to the host dwelling.

7. Regarding the argument put forward by the appellant that there is little architectural interest in uniformity and that variety is required to create interest and character. This first depends on the architectural style and quality of any development. Secondly while No.12A is an anomaly due to it being detached, it still preserves the character of the street by virtue of its matching ridge height and roof pitch. While the proposal retains the roof material and eaves height, this does not outweigh the harm in raising the ridge height and change in roof style. This proposal due to its bulk and height will be out of keeping with the character of this street and does not provide positive interest to either the street or No.12A.
8. The roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan which require that new development makes a positive contribution to high quality design and place making. The development would also fail to accord with the Watford Residential Design Guide 2016 which supports extensions which respect the character and scale of the host building and roof forms which complements the roof forms of neighbouring buildings and the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

9. The appellant cites government support for upward extensions which has led to the expansion of permitted development rights. In addition, a supporting neighbour letter was received. However, these do not remove the need for development to be sympathetic to local character which is reflected in government policy. These matters therefore attract limited weight in favour of the development and do not outweigh the harm which I have found.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant needs extra space for their family. However, there is limited evidence to demonstrate that the appeal scheme is the only means by which the additional accommodation needs could be met. Therefore, dismissing the appeal would not unacceptably violate the human rights of the appellant and their family. On this basis the decision is proportionate and justifiable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR