



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/24/3354034

49 Caxton Road, Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire EN11 9NZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Lorenzo Rodia against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/23/0661/HF.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and part two storey, part single storey front and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 12 December 2024, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published and corrected on 7 February 2025. There is no need to invite further comments from the Council or the appellant on the revisions as there are no fundamental changes relevant to the appeal before me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area;
 - the effect of the proposal on the public highway.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property forms the end terrace of a row of houses with broadly similar proportions. It forms a corner plot with public highway to the north, bordered on the opposite side of Caxton Road by a hedgerow. The terraced row has a staggered building line of a predominantly linear arrangement with projections being single storey. The immediate surroundings feature a variety of materials with several properties appearing to have been altered from their original form. The host building is typical of the style of property in the area.
5. The proposed extensions would wrap around the northern elevation of the dwelling, creating both front and rear two-storey projections. The extensions would disrupt the linear two-storey form of the terrace, resulting in a prominent and uncharacteristic extension to the block when viewed as a whole. The bulk and massing of the proposal would be most acutely experienced from the side

elevation. Given the positioning of the dwelling on a corner plot, this would represent an excessive scale of development with a disproportionately wide side gable, when taken in the context of the host building. The design of the proposal does not relate to the character of the terrace row as a whole and, consequently, would have an unbalancing effect.

6. The appellant has provided examples of developments elsewhere in the area, but I do not find these to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal. This is because the harm arising from the appeal proposal does not relate solely to the rear or front projections, but to the cumulation of proposed development which would create an overly wide side elevation with a gable end roof construction.
7. It is suggested within the appellant's statement that the value of the immediate street scene is lessened by the presence of an overgrown hedgerow, to the north of the appeal site. The hedgerow in question was observed during my site visit and I do not consider that its appearance amounts to visual harm. In any case, the proposed development relates to a permanent building of substantial scale which is in no way equivalent to existing greenery.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (BLP) (2020) which, amongst other matters, seek to enhance local character and in respect to extensions to existing development, respect the character and design of the host building.

Public highway

9. The appeal site includes land which forms public highway which has been partially enclosed by a fence. The development proposed would be partly situated on this land which the Council alleges would be an unauthorised use of such land. Policy ORC3 of the BLP states that there will be a presumption against the loss of amenity spaces, unless that space no longer provides an amenity to the local area.
10. Even without the fence enclosure, the ability for this area of land to make a positive contribution to the infrastructure of the local area is limited given its narrow extent and implicit proximity to existing built form. On this basis, I do not consider that the land affected by the development holds notable public value as an amenity space which justifies resisting the development.
11. The evidence in relation to the land potentially being required for future highways works is not sufficiently precise or persuasive, with no current highway improvement scheme being presented. The Council's reason for refusal in relation to this main issue is therefore disproportionate to the proposal. I find no reason to conclude the development is contrary to either Policy ORC3 of the BLP or Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (2018), which amongst other matters, seeks to provide for safe and efficient travel.

Other Matters

12. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's desire to extend their family home, this represents a personal circumstance that does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. Although I have found that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the public highway, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. This brings the scheme into conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Accordingly, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR