



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2025

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 JANUARY 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/W/25/3371022

8 Woodhurst Avenue, Watford WD25 9RQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (Order).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ravinder Bassi against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00499/HPD.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4.50m for which the maximum height would be 4.00m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3.50m.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note the part of the Order cited in the reason for refusal in the decision notice. However, during the appeal, the Council confirmed that, in their view, the proposal would not accord with paragraph A.4(2)(b) of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Order. The Appellant has had an opportunity to comment, and I have assessed the scheme on this basis.
3. While I note the description of development stated in the application form, I have taken the description from the decision notice in the banner heading above, in the interests of certainty.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether or not the proposed development would be permitted development having regard to Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Order.

Reasons

5. Paragraph A.4(2)(b) of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Order requires that before beginning the development the developer must provide to the local planning authority a plan indicating the site and showing the proposed development and any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which the enlarged part will be joined. This plan was submitted as part of the appeal.
6. However, paragraph A.1(j)(iii) of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A states that development is not permitted by Class A if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, and would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.

7. The Order states that original means (a) in relation to a building, other than a building which is Crown land, existing on 1st July 1948, as existing on that date; and (b) in relation to a building, other than a building which is Crown land, built on or after 1st July 1948, as so built.
8. From my observations during the site visit, the part of the existing building sited to the rear of the garage appears to be a later extension to the original dwelling. Although this part of the dwelling may have existed since 2016, there is no evidence before me to demonstrate that it is part of the original dwellinghouse as defined in the Order.
9. The proposed rear extension would extend beyond the side wall of the existing kitchen which appears to form the side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, and would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. It would therefore not accord with paragraph A.1(j)(iii) of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Order.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would not be permitted development having regard to Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Order.

Other Matters

11. I note the evidence regarding an application for a Lawful Development Certificate. However, I have necessarily determined the appeal before me.
12. I acknowledge concerns regarding the service provided by the Council. However, I have necessarily based my assessment on its planning merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR