
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P1940/D/25/3373720

42 Sandy Lodge Road, Moor Park, Hertfordshire WD3 1LJ

- 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 Mashru against the decision of Three Rivers District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0849/FUL.
 - The development proposed is additional dormers and related alterations to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal site is situated within the Moor Park Conservation Area (CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and whether the development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Moor Park CA.

Reasons

4. The Moor Park CA is almost wholly residential in character, characterised by the presence of low density “Metroland” development from the 1930s, where two storey dwellings sit within large garden plots, within planned landscaped areas including grass verges and street trees. This provides for a notably green and spacious environment and a strong sense of the area’s heritage.
5. Sandy Lodge Road displays the above characteristics albeit the form and style of properties vary. Roof forms include pitched and hipped roofs with modestly proportioned roof dormers, including those at the appeal site, featuring sporadically within the street scene.
6. The appeal property forms a large, detached dwelling of a predominantly white rendered finish. Despite previous alterations, the dwelling makes a positive contribution to the defining characteristics of the CA, retaining a significant amount of its original character.
7. The Moor Park CA Appraisal (2006) recognises that front dormer windows can be acceptable where they are a common feature of the street scene. Whilst I did

observe numerous roof dormers on properties in the area during my site visit, these were all well-proportioned and balanced within the roof slope which they featured.

8. The proposed additional front roof dormer would have a similar appearance as the two existing front roof dormers. However, its positioning would be cramped between one of the existing roof dormers and the projecting gable of the roof. Consequently, it would create an imbalance to the appearance of the roof slope which noting the prominent position of the front elevation would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.
9. The rear elevation of the property displays a degree of asymmetry, created in part by a two-storey projecting gable. Notwithstanding this, the existing rear roof dormers are in proportion with one another which consolidates the overall appearance of the roof slope. Whilst the proposed rear roof dormer would remain subservient to the scale of the overall dwelling, it would appear bulky and cramped when taken in the context of the roof slope.
10. Paragraph 220 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) acknowledges that not all elements of a CA will necessarily contribute to its significance. Nevertheless, the appeal property as a whole makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. In terms of the front elevation, this is readily experienced within the street scene. Whilst the rear elevation makes a lesser contribution given its reduced visibility, it is still experienced from neighbouring rear gardens.
11. The proposal would erode the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and in doing so fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Moor Park CA. The development is therefore contrary to Policy DE1 of the Batchworth Neighbourhood Plan (2025), Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Three Rivers District Council Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Three Rivers District Council Development Management Policies (2013) which collectively seek for development to ensure that design quality respects local distinctiveness and context, including through conserving and enhancing heritage assets.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. Taking all of the above into account, I find the harm to the CA to be at the lower end of less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the development. In this case there is an absence of any defined, substantiated public benefits arising from the proposal.
13. I therefore conclude that the development fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 215 of the Framework, and it is not in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, and having considered all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR