



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by D J Barnes MBA BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/25/3364285

3 Cross Road, Watford, Hertfordshire WD19 4DH

- 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 and Mrs P Williams against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01134/FULH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two, part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an already extended 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated at the junction of Cross Road and King Edward Road within a primarily residential area comprising a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings of varying architectural styles. The 2-storey flank wall of the property is sited well away from the shared boundary with the footway along King Edward Road. However, this gap is partially filled by a single storey garage and a wooden shed. A circa 1.8 metre high wooden panel fence forms the shared boundary between the property's curtilage and the footway along King Edward Road.
4. The proposed development includes the demolition of the garage and removal of the shed and their replacement by a part single and part 2-storey side extension which the appellant claims would be an effective use of land within an urban area. The front elevation of the proposed 2-storey extension would be of a gable design replicating the height and form of the property's existing front gable. This extension would be wider at the front when compared to the rear. The wider first floor element of the proposed side extension would be about half the length of the existing flank wall. The proposed single storey extension would infill the gap between the 2-storey extension and the shared boundary with King Edward Road.
5. By reason of its siting at the junction, the property is a prominent feature within the streetscenes along Cross Road and King Edward Road. However, even at its widest, the width of the extension at first floor level would not project closer to the footway with King Edward Road when compared to the siting of Nos. 68 and 70.

6. The *Watford Residential Design Guide* refers to ground floor side extensions at corner plots being set 2 metres away from the street boundary but this can only be guidance and such guidance cannot address all circumstances. Elsewhere within the surrounding area, both 2-storey and single storey flank walls at road junctions are sited closer to the shared boundaries than 2 metres. In some cases, the degree of setting back is sufficient to enable a fence to be erected with the potential for access to the rear garden, including at 5 Cross Road which is located on the opposite side of King Edward Road from the property.
7. The siting of the proposed single storey extension would not replicate the relationship of the flank wall of No. 5 to the footway along King Edward Road. Also, the siting and length of the single storey extension would represent a visually dominant addition to the property when viewed along King Edward Road, even considering the crown roof form. Further, the width of the single storey extension would also contribute significantly to unbalancing the appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties when viewed from Cross Road.
8. Although not an overdevelopment of the curtilage, the length of the proposed single storey flank wall sited adjacent to the boundary would reduce the positive contribution currently made by the property's rear and side garden to the streetscene along King Edward Road. The overall scale of the appeal scheme would be a bulky, rather than subservient, addition to the property which would be visible within both streetscenes. When combined, all these matters would result in the proposed development not being of a high quality design and causing unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene along both roads. Even if matching external materials were used to construct the extensions, the appeal scheme would not represent an improvement to the streetscenes as claimed by the appellants.
9. The Planning Officer claims that the awkward roof design would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property. However, the proposed roof form of the extended property would not be particularly noticeable, including the crown roof of the single storey extension. The design of proposed the roofs is a neutral matter in the assessment of this appeal.
10. The appellants have identified other altered dwellings within the local area. However, although their contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area has been taken into account, the detailed planning circumstances of these other schemes have not been provided and, as such, limited weight is given to them in the determination of this appeal which has been assessed on its own circumstances. The appellants have also referenced there being a family need for the enlargement of the property but this need is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan which require developments to deliver high quality design. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR