



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2023

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/22/3309713

23 Shepherds Road, Watford, Hertfordshire WD18 7HU

- 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 R Jaffrey against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00829/FULH, dated 24 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Two storey rear extension and link from house to existing garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the Council determined the planning application, it has adopted the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038. The policies in the new Local Plan supersede policies from the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31, saved policies from the Watford District Plan 2000 and Watford's Residential Design Guide 2016 which were included in the Council's reason for refusal of the planning application. I have determined the appeal based on the current applicable policies in the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an attractive detached house with brick walls and a clay tiled roof, situated in the predominantly residential area of Shepherds Road. The dwellings along Shepherds Road are varied in type, style and design but are typically large, two storey detached properties with generous plots. The house lies at an angle to the road and there is a separate two storey garage building dating from the 1980s.
5. The appeal property is a locally listed building, a non-designated heritage asset in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The heritage significance of the building derives from it being a largely unaltered typical asymmetrical Arts and Crafts design building, constructed in line with plans from 1914. The local listing entry includes reference to its brick finish, two projecting gables, right hand side gable end to road and casement

windows with vertical emphasis. Despite the replacement of windows and some alterations to openings on the rear elevation, these have not affected the significance of the heritage asset. Although the listing refers only to the front, in my view the bay window details along with other details and features which are typical of the Arts and Crafts style on the rear of the property have been retained and also contribute towards its significance. Indeed, the Council's Urban Design and Conservation Manager also confirms that the significance extends beyond the front elevation.

6. Although there is no change to the plan form of the original house, the proposed dual gable rear extension would span the width of the dwelling and have ridge and eaves lines at the same height as the original property. Consequently, although a small section of the original rear roofslope would remain visible, the extension would dominate the rear of the property and its design would not reflect the character of the original house, causing considerable harm to the significance of the locally listed building. With a depth of 5.5m, the extension would create a long, high flank wall on the side (north) elevation which would fail to show any subservience to the original building. Overall, the height, width and depth of the proposed extension would result in a bulky addition to the dwelling which would not be subservient to it, with the upper part of the side (north) elevation being particularly conspicuous in views from Shepherds Road.
7. Whilst there is a gate and small wall between the house and the garage building, the two buildings appear separate. The proposal includes a two-storey link between them which would increase massing and remove the separation between the original Arts and Crafts design house and the 1980s building when viewed from Shepherds Road, impinging on views from the street of the side (south) gable end.
8. The proposed changes to the window openings and removal of the small balcony and doors on the rear elevation of the garage building affect the more modern construction and would not harm the appearance of the host property.
9. The appellant has referred to recent approvals for extensions in the vicinity. This includes the locally listed No 7 Shepherds Road where the scale and form of the extensions are not comparable to the appeal proposal. The sizes of the extensions at No 22 Shepherds Road and No 354 Hempstead Road are also referred to but these buildings are not locally listed and are of limited relevance to the current appeal.
10. When taking a balanced judgement having regard to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, I find the scale of harm unacceptable. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the Framework.
11. I note that the proposals are intended to provide suitable accommodation for family members who are disabled and children. Therefore, I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The duty includes having regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and advance equality of opportunity between those sharing relevant protected characteristics and those who do not. Whilst I am mindful of the needs of the family members, it has not been demonstrated that the scale and design of the proposal is specific to their needs, or that they cannot be met by a less harmful scheme. Therefore, the PSED considerations

do not outweigh the harm that I have identified, and following careful consideration of these matters, I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing this appeal is proportionate and justified.

12. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the host property as a non-designated heritage asset. It would be contrary to Policies SS1.1, QD6.1, QD6.2, QD6.4, HE7.1 and HE7.3 of the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038. Together, these require developments outside the core development area to have regard to existing context, reflect and reinforce local character, make a positive contribution to high quality design, and preserve and enhance the character, appearance and setting of non-designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR