

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2020

**by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 04 September 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/20/3248665**

**36 Bonney Grove, Goffs Oak, Waltham Cross EN7 5LS**

- 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 Charlie Bullock against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 07/19/1077/HF, dated 22 November 2011, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2020.
  - The development proposed is loft conversion.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. During the determination of the appeal I was made aware that the Broxbourne Borough Council Local Plan 2020 ('the LP') was adopted on 23 June 2020 and I have subsequently been provided with Policies DSC1, DSC2 and EQ1 of the LP. I am required to determine this appeal on the basis of the development plan and national policy which are in place at the time of my decision. In the interests of natural justice both parties were given a further opportunity to comment on the implications of its adoption for the appeal. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the LP, and I have had regard to the comments received.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

## Reasons

4. At my visit I observed a single box projecting dormer on the front roof slope of No. 10 Bonney Grove. Although close to the appeal site that development is viewed in a slightly different context because that property is part of a different group and is in a less prominent location. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a similar development at No. 54 Barrow Lane which I observed to be close to the junction with Bonney Grove. Planning permission appears to have been granted by the Council for 2 similar dormer windows, but that permission was in 2014, is of some vintage and although in the locality that property is also not within the same group of properties as the appeal site and does not share the same streetscene.

5. Moreover, in both cases I have not been provided with the full details so cannot be certain that they are directly comparable to the proposal before me. In any event, each case must be determined on its own merits, based on bespoke and site-specific considerations and I must use my own observations and judgement.
6. Having done so, I observed proportionate rooflights in the front roof slopes of some of the properties, a small number of modest ground floor front extensions under pitched roofs and glimpses of the side elevations of rear facing dormer windows. Nonetheless, on entering Bonney Grove from its junction with Barrow Lane the combination of its sloping topography, the stepped nature of the single storey dwellings on its eastern side and the lack of significant development within the front roof slopes, forms a strong, uniform, and conspicuous appearance that positively contributes to the appearance of the Bonney Grove streetscene.
7. The proposed dormers would be set high in the roof slope, much higher than any existing rooflights or other development and to the same height as the ridge of the host property. They would impose a markedly unsympathetic form of development onto the upper part of the roof slope which would harmfully dominate the simple and traditional form of this single storey, modest bungalow. On entering Bonney Grove and from a number of other points within it, the eye would be unacceptably drawn to what would be unduly prominent and overly dominant additions to the roof and such incongruity would also be evident from neighbouring properties. In such a context the proposal would be harmfully at odds with the character and appearance of the host property and detrimental to the visual interests of its surroundings. It would not represent the sufficiently high standard of design required by local and national planning policy and would not be an enhancement.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the LP which, require development to enhance local character and distinctiveness considering patterns of development, building typology and details, height, and roof form, amongst others. Further, that extensions and alterations do not unduly impact on the parent building and wider setting.

## **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would not accord with a recently adopted and up to date development plan, when read as a whole. As such it would not be the sustainable development for which paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') indicates a presumption in favour.
10. Material considerations, including the Framework do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with that plan. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard Aston*

INSPECTOR