



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2023

by L Francis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/W/23/3321752

50 Wavell Close, Cheshunt, Hertfordshire EN8 0LA

- 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 Mrs L Davey against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/22/1159/F, dated 4 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is creation of new build residential unit and rear extension of No. 50 Wavell Close.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended by the council in its decision letter. I have used the description of development as written on the planning application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 52 Wavell Close, with particular regard to outlook.
 - Whether the proposal provides suitable storage for refuse and recycling facilities.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the area

4. The area is characterised by brick built, 2 storey terraced houses. The appeal site is located at the end of a short terrace of 3 houses. It is set in a substantial plot with a front lawn and a partially paved drive to the side, along with a rear garden. Immediately to the north lies a terrace of four single storey houses. This part of Wavell Close and Cunningham Road opposite has a more verdant, spacious character than the more southerly section of Wavell Close due to the short terraces, front lawns and substantial grass verges and planting. It is notable that the majority of end of terrace houses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are either set away from their side boundaries, or have just a single storey element up to the side boundary, which adds to the sense of openness.

5. I acknowledge the proposed house and single storey rear extension would fit appropriately with the appearance of the rest of the terrace in terms of scale, use of materials and style of fenestration. Notwithstanding the presence of the strip of land adjacent to the north, the construction of the proposed 2 storey house flush with the side boundary would have the effect of making the house appear cramped in relation to its plot, and consequently reduce the sense of openness to this part of the street. Thus the proposed development would appear cramped, in conflict with, and consequently harmful to, the spacious character and appearance of the immediate area.
6. My attention has been drawn to the presence of a similar development at 2 Wavell Close¹. The context for this example is different, being located in a part of Wavell Close that appears more densely developed, with longer, more uniform terraces. It does not have the same sense of openness as the more northerly section containing the appeal site. I also note the reference to an approved extension² at the appeal site and its similarities with the appeal proposal. Whilst it may be similar in several respects, the approved extension is set away from the side boundary.
7. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. This runs contrary to the principles of policy DSC 1 of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2020 which, amongst other things, requires development proposals to, wherever possible, enhance local character and distinctiveness. The scheme would also conflict with the aims of the council's Borough-wide Supplementary Planning Guidance (updated 2013) in relation to side additions to terraces, advising a set back from the side boundary to give visual separation from adjacent dwellings, along with having regard to the general spacing of properties from boundaries within the vicinity.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

8. The front window of number 52 Wavell Close currently has a very open outlook over the street and grassed area beyond. Although the building line of the proposed house would be set some distance in front of the window to number 52, given the presence of the strip of land to the side providing a little separation, and the otherwise very open outlook, no harmful sense of overbearing or enclosure would result. This matter holds neutral weight in my determination of this appeal.
9. In this respect therefore, I find that the outlook of number 52 Wavell Close would not be unduly affected and would be in line with the aims of policy EQ1 of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2020 which requires proposals for development to avoid detrimental impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties in terms of outlook, amongst other matters.

Refuse and recycling storage

10. During my site visit I noted that refuse and recycling storage is commonly located to the front of the terraced dwellings in the area. The submitted drawings show that there is sufficient depth to the parking spaces to allow refuse and recycling storage. Given that the space is available, I consider that this element of the proposals could have effectively been dealt with by planning condition had the appeal been allowed. On this matter I therefore find no

¹ Reference 07/17/0649/F – erection of a 3 bed end of terrace 2 storey dwelling.

² No reference supplied – drawing number SK02 dated 8 October 2022.

conflict with policy EQ1 (iii) of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2020 which requires all proposals to include provision for refuse and recycling storage. This matter holds neutral weight in my determination of the appeal.

Planning balance

11. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would have economic benefits in the form of construction employment, subsequent maintenance and the use of local services by future residents. There would also be potential biodiversity enhancements that could be secured as part of the overall development. The dwelling would contribute to the Council's housing stock and is in a sustainable location. However, given the development comprises only a single additional dwelling, the benefits described above are very small scale and the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area outweighs these benefits.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it is contrary to the development plan read as a whole. The material considerations in this case do not indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

L Francis

INSPECTOR