



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 NOVEMBER 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/W/25/3370878**

**Ground Floor Flat, 15A Westland Road, Watford, Hertfordshire WD17 1QR**

- 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 M Courtney against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
  - The application ref. is 24/01172/FUL.
  - The development proposed is extension and subdivision of existing ground floor flat into 2 x one bed studio flats and associated external changes, bin/cycle stores, boundary treatment and amenity area.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The address on the banner heading above is taken from the Council's decision notice and differs from that on the planning application form. The appellant has confirmed that the above address is correct for the purposes of this appeal.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
  - whether the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers of Flat 1, having particular regard to the provision of outdoor private amenity space, outlook, privacy and sunlight; and
  - the effect of the proposed development on on-street parking.

### Reasons

#### *Living conditions*

4. The appeal site comprises a west-facing two-storey end terrace house with double height bay windows to the front and a two-storey outrigger to the rear, which has been subdivided into ground and upper floor flats. There is only a small gap to the unattached neighbour and there are no windows in the side elevation. Across the street are similar terraces or semi-detached pairs of houses of similar character. Behind the subject terrace are large office blocks and hotels.
5. The proposal would extend to the rear and further divide the ground floor into front and rear studio flats, the effect of which would be to create single aspect dwellings. An assessment found that daylight in both flats would meet guidance levels. However, whilst the bay window of the front flat would provide some sunlight and

outlook to its occupants, the bedroom area would be some distance away from this window, resulting in poor outlook and limited sunlight to that room.

6. While the proposal would meet the size requirements for private outdoor amenity space for this type of accommodation, the front garden has an awkward shape and is close to bin and cycle stores and the street. It would therefore not be suitable as outdoor amenity space for the occupier of the front flat, as it would be difficult to use, noisy and lack privacy. This is of particular concern, given that the nearest public open spaces are a kilometre or more away.
7. It would therefore fail to provide an adequate standard of living accommodation for future occupiers with regard to amenity space, outlook, privacy and sunlight. This would be contrary to Policies HO3.11 and QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan 2021-2038 (WLP), which require adequate private amenity space and healthy and attractive internal and external environments. I attach significant weight to these conflicts with policy.

### *Parking*

8. The appeal site is close to the railway station and town centre and is located within a Controlled Parking Zone. The street has raised junction tables and marked spaces restricted to permit holders from 8am to 10pm every day. It was heavily parked during my site visit on a weekday afternoon during term-time.
9. Whilst willing to contribute to sustainable transport or to restrict applications for parking permits, the appellant has not made a planning agreement or unilateral undertaking. As no other means of addressing parking demand is proposed, future occupiers would therefore be more likely to depend on cars and park on the street, leading to additional on-street parking in an already congested area.
10. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policies ST11.1 and ST11.5 of the WLP, which require development to reduce car dependency and limit car parking. I attach significant weight to these conflicts with policy.

### **Other matters**

11. I acknowledge that the application would provide additional housing, but it would be limited in scale and, as I have found, not provide an adequate standard of living conditions. In this case, I therefore only attach modest weight to this benefit.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*S Simms*

INSPECTOR