



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/25/3370897

11 Maple Grove, Langwood Gardens, Watford WD17 4JZ

- 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 Damian Manhertz against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00299/FULH.
 - The development proposed is an enlarged replacement roof with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for an enlarged replacement roof with rear dormer at 11 Maple Grove, Watford WD17 4JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 25/00299/FULH and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) Other than indicated on the approved plans, 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: OS based Location Plan; Drawing Nos. 2320-4-005PD Rev. A; 2317-4-229; 2317-4-005PD Rev. A; 2317-4-010PD Rev. A; 2317-4-020PD Rev. A; 2317-4-110 Rev. D; 2317-4-120 Rev. D.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is in the middle of a row of bungalows at the head of a cul-de-sac of 12 bungalows of two different designs, albeit with variety in their external materials, post-construction rear extensions and orientations / building lines.
4. The appeal scheme seeks to extend the construction of first floor accommodation that would occupy almost the whole of the existing roof rear plane and additionally necessitating 0.5m increase in ridge height.
5. The Officer's Report refers to a similar scheme at the property granted under Ref. 24/01156/LDC as being lawful permitted development in February 2025. It argues that the now proposed increase in the height and width of the roof extension

together with the aforementioned 0.5m increase in ridge height would be a dominant addition to the dwelling and also detract from the character and appearance of the area. It is therefore considered that this would be contrary to the Residential Design Guide and to Local Plan policies.

6. However, in my view the effect of the proposal would not be one as to appear unduly dominant to the existing building, but to change its character and appearance to that of a purposely designed chalet bungalow. This is possible because of the simple design of the existing building and in particular its roof, combined with the modest increase in scale from the earlier permission.
7. Nor would the appeal scheme draw the eye as being out of keeping with its surroundings. As the grounds of appeal point out, because the properties at the end of the cul de sac sit on different land levels and have different distances and relationships in relation to the road, there is a perceived lack of visual consistency of ridge heights. This cannot be appreciated from a solely desk-based appraisal with no site visit, as was the case with this application. Furthermore, with its rearward setting, any sight of the rear roof extension from the public domain would be difficult if not impossible. As regards the front rooflights, these would not be of a size to harm the appearance of the dwelling from the road.
8. Overall, I find that the appeal scheme would not be in harmful conflict with Policies QD6.2 and QD 6.4 of the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038; Section 8.12.1 of the Watford Residential Design Guide 2016, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
9. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring matching external materials where appropriate will preserve visual amenity. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR