



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/23/3333084

103 Church Lane, Cheshunt, Waltham Cross, EN8 0DU

- 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 Marco Silva against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/23/0552/HF, dated 27 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear and side extension with front entrance porch.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The Council states that the description of the development is incorrect as the 'front entrance porch' should be considered as an extension. It is a relatively minor point, but as the proposal includes a wc, I agree with the Council. However, it has no bearing on the main issue or the planning considerations.
2. I also note that the Council's description of the development differs from the planning application form, as it refers to a rear and side dormer. I consider it to be an accurate and fuller description and, therefore, I have considered the proposal on that basis.

Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling, which faces Church Lane within a predominantly residential area. It is visually prominent due to its projecting two storey gable, which is a strong feature in the terrace. A number of properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have been altered and extended, including the adjoining dwelling at number 101. That includes a larger dormer addition at the rear.
6. The proposal is to enlarge the property by constructing a front entrance porch and a two-storey rear and side extension. The development would also involve alterations to the roof and a rear/side facing dormer.

7. The Council considers that the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the property and that the roof design would be out of character with the existing dwelling. Consequently, the Council states that the proposal conflicts with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2020 (LP). Policy DSC1 seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that the design of development is of a high standard and enhances local character, whilst Policy DSC2 requires extensions to respect the character and design of the host building and its wider setting. I consider these policies to accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (The Framework), which contains similar provisions.
8. I agree with the Council that both the ground floor front extension and the rear extension are acceptable. Furthermore, I consider that a rear dormer should also be acceptable in principle, given the existing dormer at number 101.
9. However, the combined rear/side dormer would be an incongruous, overly dominant and discordant feature, because of its size and irregular form. In my opinion it would be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the property. Furthermore, although the dwelling is set-back from Church Lane, the side dormer and part of the roof would be clearly visible and I consider that the disruption to the roofscape would have an unacceptable impact on the streetscene. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan and with The Framework, as referred to above.
10. In reaching my decision, I have considered the existence of other extensions that have been approved by the Council in the local area, including those brought to my attention by the appellant. However, each property is different and I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits. Therefore, I am not persuaded that the existence of other extensions should act as a precedent for this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR