



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/25/3371675
20B Cherrydale, Watford WD18 7UL

- 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 Mawjee against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00468/FULH.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey rear and two storey side/rear extensions ; conversion of a garage to a habitable room including changing a door to a window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of Nos. 135, 135A and 137 Rickmansworth Road as regards outlook.

Reasons

3. The Notice of Refusal refers to the proposed extension having an overbearing effect on Nos. 135 and 137 Rickmansworth Road. However, I saw on my visit that there are three properties with rear gardens: Nos. 135, 135A and 137. At my visit I was able to visit the rear gardens of No. 135 and 137, whilst it would appear from the front door of No. 135A that the building is in the form of flats.
4. The relationship of the rear garden of No. 135 with the proposed extensions at 20B Cherrydale is sufficiently offset to avoid it being materially affected by the appeal scheme. As regards No. 135A, there is a row of mature conifer trees which provide effective screening of the building.
5. The proposed first floor addition above the existing single storey side addition to 20B Cherrydale would affect the outlook from No. 135A but there would be mitigation as this extension would be mostly if not wholly within the existing outline of the built form of the main part of the dwelling. In addition, there is the tree screening. On balance, I consider that any effect on the living conditions in terms of outlook for the occupiers of Nos. 135 and 135A would not be such as to warrant a refusal of permission.
6. Turning to the dwelling at No. 137, the 30m or thereabouts length of the rear garden would mean that the proposed extensions at No. 20B Cherrydale would not significantly affect the outlook from the rear windows. However, the rear garden slopes upwards to the appeal site and there is currently a clear view of the existing

two storey building which 'looms large' on and close to the boundary, but at present this is partly relieved by the sight of the sky to the west.

7. The proposed ground floor extension to form part of a large kitchen/dining/living area and the addition of a first floor to provide a large bedroom and ensuite, although set back from the existing single storey side addition, would both bring the existing two-storey element closer to the boundary with No. 137 and increase its length, thereby to some extent reducing the existing view of the sky.
8. Again, there would be partial mitigation to the extent that the additions are set against the outline of the existing building, but when combined with the extension referred to in paragraph 5 above, there would, overall, be an unacceptable length and mass of built form that would be overbearing and result in an undue enclosure of a substantial part of the rear garden of No. 137. The adverse effect would be exacerbated by the elevated position of the appeal site in relation to No. 137 and if the compass north point on the appeal plans is correct there may also be the prospect of at least some increase in shadowing of the garden.
9. I have had regard to the fact that this is an amended scheme with the overall height of the side wall reduced from 5.15m to 4.5m. However, this has not resolved the objection on the main issue in the appeal. In simple terms, No. 20B Cherrydale is already a large building on higher land when seen from the garden of No. 137 and the appeal scheme would make its impact noticeably worse.
10. For these reasons, I find on the main issue that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 137 Rickmansworth Road as regards outlook. This would conflict with Policies QD6.2 & QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038; Sections 8.4 & 8.6 of the Council's Residential Design Guide 2016, and with paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.

Conclusion

11. Accordingly, the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR