



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 FEBRUARY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/24/3353692

29 Carnaby Road, Broxbourne, Hertfordshire, EN10 7EG

- 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 Navin Shah against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/24/0590/HF.
 - The development proposed is two storey extensions to north and south elevations and addition of a floor to create a three storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling on Carnaby Road in Broxbourne. Carnaby Road is a residential street with mostly large, two-storey, detached dwellings with generous front and rear gardens. There are examples of substantial dwellings near to the appeal site including Nos 27 and 33 which are of a similar scale to the proposed development.
5. In general, the dwellings on the road do not have a consistent design, scale or style, with a broad range of front elevation designs, extensions, external materials and roof styles present. Therefore, the development on the site of a substantial dwelling with a bespoke design is acceptable in principle, as evidenced by a previous permission for significant extensions on the site.
6. There are several discrepancies between the proposed elevations and floor and roof plans. For example, the bathroom front windows at ground and first floors are smaller on plan than in elevation. The first-floor plan shows two windows above the garage whereas the elevation and roof plan show a single dormer window. The rear lounge window and Bedroom 2 dormer above are shown as different sizes on the elevation, roof and floor plans. These errors cast some

doubt on the detail of what is proposed, however, the overall scale and design proposed is evident, so I am able to consider the appeal on that basis.

7. The proposed plans show numerous window designs on the various elevations and within the proposed new crown roof. Several very small dormer windows are shown on the front and rear elevations. These would be substantially smaller than any of the other windows making them appear disproportionately small, particularly in relation to the substantial size of the proposed dwelling.
8. The slope of the roof would not be symmetrical, creating an unbalanced appearance for the whole dwelling. Further, the side extensions are of different widths which, whilst not necessarily problematic on its own, in this case would further contribute to the imbalance of the resulting property.
9. This imbalance would be reinforced by the different window sizes and styles either side of the new front central feature and the position of the dormer above the garage on the edge of the diagonal section of that extension. Similarly, the ground and first floor windows and doors on the rear elevation would not be aligned in most cases, creating an awkward and incoherent appearance.
10. For these reasons, the overall design of the proposed development would be unbalanced and incoherent. Consequently, it would not deliver high quality design and would appear incongruous and harmful in the street scene. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the local area. Consequently, it would not comply with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2018-2033 (2020) which require that developments must enhance local character and have a design and external appearance that does not unduly impact upon the wider setting.

Other Matter

11. The proposed garage would not achieve the 6m minimum depth set out in the Borough-wide Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted 2004, updated 2013) (SPG). However, the appeal site could accommodate the amount of parking recommended in the SPG for a property of its size, so the size of the garage would not result in underprovision of parking or harm in this respect.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR