



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y1945/D/25/3372798

Rhodes House, 12A Rose Gardens, Watford, Herts WD18 0JB

- 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 S Taylor against the decision of Watford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00378/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a double & single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double & single storey rear extension at Rhodes House, 12A Rose Gardens, Watford, Herts WD18 0JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00378/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: SHT No 2, Planning Extract -1 Site Centred.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter & Main Issue

3. I note the Council's concerns in relation to whether the appeal building is a single dwelling or two flats along with residential curtilage inaccuracies. During my site visit, I observed that the garden was subdivided with two separate entrances, and the front door had two buzzers and reference to two separate units.
4. Whilst this might suggest that the site is two flats, there is no planning or legal position to confirm it. Moreover, the appeal scheme, in terms of its description and submitted plans, is for a singular dwelling to be extended at ground floor and first floor. I have no reason to believe that the scheme would not revert to its apparent lawful use. Moreover, any planning permission granted would not approve the subdivision of the building into two flats. The resolution of this matter is for the main parties.
5. Therefore, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area and b) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at Number 12 Rose Gardens (No 12) with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached building set back from and facing the road. It bears design and composition similarities with the remainder of others in the street scene, most of which are semi-detached examples with some, including the appeal building, having a two-storey projection to the rear. The consistency of form, design and siting positively identifies the street.
7. The additional rearward projection of the existing extension would extend beyond where the majority of others do but the totality of its length would be modest and the stepped in first floor, along with a ridge height below the main building, would ensure it be read as a clearly subservient addition. It would be to the rear and mostly shielded from any direct influence on the public realm. It would be viewed from neighbouring gardens, but it would be proportionate with the dwelling even with a bulkier side elevation. It, despite being slightly longer, would mirror some of the other neighbouring rearward extensions. It would therefore not cause harm to the character or appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would thus comply with Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the Watford Local Plan 2021 (LP), Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and sections 8.2 and 8.5 of the Watford Residential Design Guide 2016 (DG) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Living Conditions

9. The proposal would be adjacent the boundary of No 12 with a separation gap between the properties by virtue of both access pathways to Nos 12a and 12. The overall height and protrusion of the proposal would be modest against the boundary, and its subservient form and design would be somewhat similar to the existing situation to not unacceptably harm the outlook to occupiers. Moreover, the separation distance between the two properties would alleviate the impression of a bulkier elevation, therefore ensuring the occupants would not perceive a tunnelling effect. Even with the lack of rear extension to No 12, the occupiers' outlook and light perceived from within the garden and living space of the property would remain primarily unincumbered given the context of the built form around it and the otherwise open aspect to the rear garden.
10. The first-floor element would marginally exceed the limitations of the 45-degree code within the DG. However, whilst there may be some technical conflict with the first-floor extension, its modest length, existing built form and separation distance would not result in unacceptable harm in terms of outlook to the ground floor or upper floor windows.
11. With these matters in mind, and notwithstanding the technical conflict with the DG, this would not translate to harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 12. It would therefore comply with Policies QD6.2 and QD6.4 of the LP, Section 8.4 of the DG and Chapter 12 of the Framework which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of properties are protected.

Other Matter

12. The main parties have made numerous references to other dwellings in terms of the prevailing street scene. However, limited information has been given on if and when they were granted planning permission. In any event, the scheme has been considered based on the situation at hand, the evidence and my findings on site.

Conditions

13. The time limit condition and reference to the approved plans are required for enforcement purposes. I have not included a materials condition as the plans contain sufficient acceptable detail and have been secured by their own condition. The Council has not recommended any other conditions, and I have not considered any others to be necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I have no reason to recommend other than that the appeal should be allowed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above

John Morrison

INSPECTOR