



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/25/3375048

7 Shepherds Road, Watford, Hertfordshire WD18 7HU

- 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 Shah against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00609/FULH.
 - The development proposed is 'new ground floor porch and first floor extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

3. Dwellings on Shepherds Road are typically detached properties of traditional appearance, although variety in the form, architectural style and detailing of individual buildings provides for diversity in the street scene. Furthermore, many have stepped front building lines and I observed differences in the orientation and positioning of neighbouring properties, including a notable step between 13 and 15 Shepherds Road, so that while buildings are generally set back from the street, the overall building line is not uniform.
4. The appeal relates to an asymmetric dwelling with distinctive Arts and Crafts style detailing including hipped and catslide roof forms with flared eaves, a decorative chimney stack and decorative surrounds to windows.
5. The proposed extension would sit to the front of the dwelling between existing gable and hipped roof forward projections, where there is currently a section of catslide roof with a small dormer. It would step forward of both existing projections, extending the front of the dwelling closer to the street at two-storey level.
6. The Council's Residential Design Guide 2016 ('the RDG') states that developing forward of the front elevation of an existing building will not generally be acceptable, particularly where there is a strong building line within the street.
7. In this case however, the development would project only a fairly small distance forward of the existing dwelling, and it would not step significantly beyond the forwardmost part of the neighbour at 5 Shepherds Road which is positioned on a slight angle to the appeal dwelling. Furthermore, and contrary to the Council's suggestion that it is strong and consistent, I have noted above that the building line

along Shepherds Road is not uniform with notable differences in the forward positioning of some dwellings. Against this context, I am satisfied that the extension of development forward of the existing front elevation would not cause harmful disruption to the building line and would not in itself be conspicuous or visually dominant within the street.

8. Be that as it may, the RDG also includes guidance that extensions must respect the character and scale of the host building; complement the size, shape and character of the existing property; and have a roof form, pitch and angle that respects that of the host property.
9. Although the extension would have a hipped roof, this would have a markedly shallower angle in contrast to the existing roof forms to the front of the dwelling. Moreover, the submitted plans indicate that it would lack the flared eaves which are a characteristic feature of the building when seen from the street. Taking these factors together and notwithstanding that the scale of the extension would be generally subordinate to the dwelling and that a planning condition could ensure sympathetic external materials, I find that the development would fail to respect or complement the host property. Instead, it would form an awkward and discordant addition that would notably detract from the quality, character and appearance of the dwelling and the extension would stand out as an incongruous element within the wider street scene as a whole resulting in detriment to the character and appearance of the area.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal taken as a whole would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, and it would conflict with Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the Local Plan 2021-2038. Broadly and amongst other things, these policies seek well-designed buildings that are visually attractive and require proposals to make a positive contribution to high quality design and place-making. Furthermore, I find that the development would not be well-designed such that the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that it should be refused.

Conclusion

11. I note that neighbouring occupiers have not objected to the development but this is a neutral factor which weighs neither for nor against the proposal. I find for the reasons given above that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR