
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/17/3180258

1 Yew Walk, Hoddesdon, Herts EN11 8BB

- 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 Philip Lee against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/17/0274/HF, dated 16 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as the conversion of the existing garage to a living room, the erection of a new garage with accommodation in roof space, addition of a dormer and 2 skylights, roof and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the conversion of the existing garage to a living room, the erection of a new garage with accommodation in roof space, addition of a dormer. I allow the appeal in so far as it relates to 2 skylights, roof and internal alterations at 1 Yew Walk, Hoddesdon, Herts EN11 8BB in accordance with the terms of application Ref 07/17/0274/HF, dated 16 March 2017, 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 the following approved plans: 1246 004; 1246 005.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof alterations hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hoddesdon Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a predominately 2-storey detached house which, together with its neighbours 2 and 3 Yew Walk, was constructed in the late 1970s in an area that was formerly garden land. It is located within a part of the Hoddesdon Conservation Area that is characterised by relatively large and well-spaced houses set within a verdant setting. The 3 properties are accessed

via a gravel-surfaced private lane which is flanked by mature vegetation and contributes to the sylvan character of the Conservation Area.

4. The proposal would primarily comprise the erection of a double garage addition with living space above which would extend close to and face the lane. I note that the extension is unlikely to be visible from Yewlands or from points close to the entrance of Dallington and would be viewed obliquely at points further along the lane. However, due to its size, design and siting close to the lane the proposal would have an urbanising effect on this otherwise sylvan environment.
5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Hoddesdon Conservation Area. It is therefore contrary to Policies HD10 and HD16 of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2001-2011 (2005) which, amongst other matters, seek new development in conservation areas that is based on an understanding of local characteristics and context and respects the density of development in an area.
6. The proposal would also involve alterations to the existing roofs including the installation of two rooflights and alterations to the existing dormers. I am satisfied that these minor changes would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and therefore accords with the aforementioned policies. As the alterations to the existing roof would be physically and functionally separate from the proposed extension a split decision allowing these works can be issued.

Conditions

7. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is imposed.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the extension but succeed in respect of the alterations to the existing roof.

S Poole

INSPECTOR