



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2025

by Robert Fallon B.Sc. (Hons) PGDipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 JULY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/25/3364582

18 Mansion Drive, Tring, Hertfordshire, HP23 5BD

- 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 Garfield Jones against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00070/FHA.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Two storey side extension and conversion of existing garage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the conversion of the existing garage and planning permission is granted for the conversion of the existing garage at 18 Mansion Drive, Tring, HP23 5BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00070 and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted, insofar as it relates to the conversion of the existing garage, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: - 102 (proposed elevations); 103 (proposed floorplans) and 202 (existing and proposed block plans).

Main Issue

2. The Council has raised no objections to the conversion of the existing garage, which is not linked to the proposed two-storey side extension or dependent on it.
3. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host building and heritage assets, with particular reference to the Tring Conservation Area and No 12 Rothschild Place.

Reasons

Appeal site context

4. The appeal site consists of a post-WWII detached dwelling which forms part of a wider scheme of similar style properties constructed on both sides of the former main entrance to Tring Park Mansion. The road has a spacious and verdant

character with properties set back from the road behind lawned gardens, shrubs, mature trees and hedging. Mansion Drive lies on the outskirts of the historic High Street and within the Tring Conservation Area ('the conservation area').

5. To the west of the site lies No 12 Rothschild Place ('No. 12'), a small dwelling occupying the former stables to the Rose & Crown Hotel, a large and imposing building that fronts onto the High Street that was recently converted into a mixed-use scheme incorporating 39 residential units. Although No 12 is not identified as a listed building or local listed building, I am satisfied that it constitutes a non-designated heritage asset because of its aesthetic and historic interest.

Character and appearance

6. By reason of its minimal 100mm setback, the proposed extension would neither appear subservient to the host dwelling or result in the creation of a more prominent architectural addition that enhances the overall character of the building in its own right. It would as a consequence appear incongruous and harm the contribution the host dwelling makes to the conservation area. The development would also be publicly visible when approaching from both directions on Mansion Drive, which would intensify its harmful impact.
7. The proposed extension would also reduce public views of No. 12 to the rear, which is of local aesthetic & historic interest and makes a positive contribution to this part of the conservation area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties on Mansion Drive which have also been extended. However, I found none of these to be similar in scale, form, design or contextual setting to the scheme before me. I have as a consequence considered the proposal on its own merits.
9. In view of the above, I conclude that the scheme would conflict with Policy 120 of the Local Plan¹ and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy², which collectively seek, amongst other things, for developments to; (1) conserve and enhance the integrity, setting & distinctiveness of designated & undesignated heritage assets and the character and appearance of the area; and (2) in the case of extensions, be complementary and sympathetic to the established character of the building to be altered or extended.

Planning balance

10. The proposed two storey side extension would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, when considered as a whole. This harm would be to a low level of less than substantial harm. The scheme would also harm the setting and related heritage significance of No. 12, with this to a low to medium level of less than substantial harm. The result is that the duties under the Act to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area³, which I have given considerable importance and weight to, would not be met.
11. Overall, I conclude that the combined harm to the significance of heritage assets would be to a low to medium level of less than substantial harm. Paragraph 212 of

¹ Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011, adopted 21 April 2004.

² Core Strategy 2006-2031, adopted 25 September 2013, Dacorum Borough Council.

³ S72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

the Framework⁴ requires that great weight should be attached to the conservation of a designated heritage asset and this is irrespective of the level of harm.

12. In accordance with Paragraph 215 of the Framework, I have weighed this harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I have also had regard to the scale of harm to the significance of No. 12 as a non-designated heritage asset in accordance with Paragraph 216.
13. Although the two storey side extension would increase the amount of living space, I do not agree with the appellant that this is necessary to ensure the ongoing viability of the host dwelling, which would continue to provide a high standard of living accommodation without it. This outcome of the proposal would therefore only be of private benefit to the appellant. In terms of public benefits, although the appellant has stated that the works would be carried out by local contractors, the small scale of the proposed development has led me to only give this limited weight in my assessment.
14. In light of the above, I consider the scheme's limited public benefit to be outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the contribution this makes to the conservation area. Similarly, I am also of the view that this limited public benefit would not outweigh the scale of harm to the significance of No 12 as a non-designated heritage asset.
15. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension does not accord with the development plan and that other material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with this.

Conditions

16. The Council has suggested conditions which I have considered in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition requiring development to be commenced within 3 years and to be in accordance with the plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition relating to external materials is necessary to ensure a high standard of development.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the conversion of the existing garage but dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey side extension.

Robert Fallon

INSPECTOR

⁴ National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 12 December 2024 (as amended on 7 February 2025).