



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/25/3370783

8 Trefusis Walk, Watford, Hertfordshire WD17 3BP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Khan against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application ref is 25/00304/FULH.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor rear part side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The application states that the appellant's name is Khan, however the appeal form uses the more complete Mr A Khan. It has been confirmed the applicant and the appellant are the same person. For clarity, I have therefore used the name on the appeal form above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 8 Trefusis Walk (No 8) is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. It has a two-storey front projection flanked by a catslide roof, and a distinctive angular arched front entrance. The architectural style of the property is shared with several other semi-detached pairs in the vicinity of the appeal site, creating a consistent pocket of development within a more varied wider street scene. The other dwellings along Trefusis Walk are either part of a semi-detached pair or are detached. Dwellings are generally well-spaced, occupy generous plots and are set back from the highway beyond either driveways or front gardens. No 8 differs from neighbouring properties to this side of the road because it incorporates a substantial box dormer which occupies the majority of its rear roof slope. Nevertheless, the orderly appearance of roofscape development on Trefusis Walk remains prevalent.

6. There is no dispute that the extension would have a discreet presence in views from the street. However, to the rear, its roof would intersect awkwardly with the box dormer and would further differentiate the dwelling from the similarly designed dwellings to either side. Even accounting for the extension's matching materials, the additional massing and mismatch of form at roof level would have a cluttered and disjointed appearance. Consequently, the proposal would not harmonise with the host dwelling and so would fail to meet section 8.2 of the Watford Borough Council Residential Design Guide (2016). It would also be visible from neighbouring windows and gardens where it would appear discordant amongst the more orderly roofscapes of surrounding dwellings.
7. The appellant suggests that the proposal would 'break up' the extent of the flat roof on the existing single storey extension. However, from what I saw, the existing form at single storey level is similar to that on neighbouring dwellings. I am also aware that there is variety of design along Trefusis Walk including some dwellings which have crown roofs. Nevertheless, dwellings are more often of a coherent aesthetic. These factors do not therefore justify the poor visual relationship of the appeal proposal with the host dwelling and its more immediate surroundings.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan (2022) which require new development to enhance the character of the local area and make a positive contribution to high quality design and place making. For the same reasons, it would fail to comply with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which is concerned with achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

9. Even though there is no dispute that the proposed development would have an acceptable relationship with neighbouring living conditions and that the resultant dwelling would be served by sufficient parking space, these matters do not justify development which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR