
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/17/3180403

2 Lilliard Close, Hoddesdon EN11 0RU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Percival against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7/17/0289/HF, dated 22 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:

(i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and

(ii) whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal space standards.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house which is situated near to the entrance of a close of houses of similar age, height and massing. In particular a common characteristic of these houses is their uniform and relatively shallow pitched roofs. The appeal property has been extended at ground and first floor levels to the rear with a shallow-pitched roof formed above.
4. The proposal would involve the replacement of the property's roof with steeper roof slopes formed to the front and sides together with an area of flat roof at the rear. Together this would enable the creation of second floor level accommodation comprising a bedroom with an en-suite. Due to its height and bulk this addition would be an overly dominant and incongruous element in the context of neighbouring properties of regular height with shallow pitched roofs. As such the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

5. For these reasons the proposal fails to comply with Policies H6, H8, HD13 and HD16 of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2001-2011 (2005) which, amongst other matters, seek high quality design that respects, and is compatible with, the scale, massing and character of the parent building and its setting. It is also contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Council's Borough-wide Supplementary Planning Guidance (2013).

Living conditions

6. The *Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard* (2015) stipulate that the minimum floor to ceiling height in dwellings should be 2.3m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area. The entirety of the second floor accommodation formed by the roof addition would have an internal floor to ceiling height that would be below this minimum requirement. However, as the proposed new accommodation would provide a fifth bedroom in a house with otherwise adequate internal space I am satisfied that, in this particular instance, occupiers of the property would retain adequate living conditions. This does not however outweigh my concerns in respect of the first main issue.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR