



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/24/3355408

23 Mandeville Close, Broxbourne, Hertfordshire EN10 7PN

- 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 Lewis Evans against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/24/0576/HF.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey front and side extension, garage conversion, front canopy and alterations to the fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the appeal proposal differs between the application form and the decision notice. Given that the planning application was amended before it was determined and the appellant has adopted the wording from the decision notice in their appeal documentation, in the interests of clarity, I have therefore used the wording from the decision notice to describe the proposed development in the banner heading.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - 1) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
 - 2) The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbours, with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Mandeville Close is a cul-de-sac predominantly comprising two-storey detached properties. Properties are organised in a mostly uniform pattern, with properties being set back from the road and with open frontages containing parking spaces. The streetscene is verdant with grass verges, hedges and trees dispersed throughout the locality. The road is predominantly linear, until the end of the cul-de-sac where the road curves. The area has a suburban character and appearance.
5. The properties within Mandeville Close have distinctive features, although some have had extensions and alterations. Some properties are designed with a facing

gable and a long catslide roof. Other properties include two side facing gables with the roof pitch facing the road. Hanging tiles and distinctive stone chimneys are also prevalent features. The end of Mandeville Close has been extended through the addition of three further properties in a differing architectural style. However, these properties read as a later addition to the area, and Mandeville Close retains a strong and perceptible character and appearance.

6. No 23 Mandeville Close is a detached property comprising a facing gable, a large catslide roof, a stone chimney and hanging tiles. The property follows the distinctive style of Mandeville Close and contributes positively to the prevailing character of the area in this regard. Whilst the property is situated towards the end of the cul-de-sac, views of No 23 are still achievable from along Mandeville Close due to the plot being situated on the return of the road.
7. The proposed development would replace the catslide roof with a two-storey extension with a hipped roof and a double pitch. The proposed ridges and eaves would be in line with the existing ridge and eaves of No 23. The design of the extension would add excessive bulk and width to the property above the ground floor. As a result, the proposal would not have a subservient appearance to the host dwelling and would be visually prominent within the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
8. Whilst matching materials and a replacement chimney stack are proposed, the positive and distinctive appearance of the property achieved through the catslide roof would be lost. It would be replaced with an extension which would be unsympathetic with the character and appearance of the host property and the wider locality.
9. For the reasons that I have given, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (2020) (the LP). These policies seek to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design and respects the character and appearance of the host building and wider area.

Living Conditions

10. The Council has set out that the proposal would result in a harmful impact on neighbouring outlook through the visual appearance of the proposed extension. The Council identify conflict with Policy EQ1 of the LP in this regard, however no specific neighbours are identified.
11. I am mindful that outlook as referred to by Policy EQ1, refers to the living conditions of neighbouring properties rather than the character and appearance of what neighbours can see within the streetscene. I have previously covered the impact on the character and appearance of the area, in which I have found harm as a result of the appeal scheme.
12. I have not, however, been presented with evidence with regard to how the proposed extension would result in the loss of outlook to any neighbouring properties in relation to their living conditions. I see no reason to find any undue harm in this regard and I am satisfied that in relation to living conditions, the proposed extension would not unduly compromise the outlook of any nearby neighbours.

13. For this reason, the proposal would not conflict with Policy EQ1 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (2020). This policy seeks to avoid detrimental impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of developments.

Other Matters

14. I have been supplied with evidence from the appellant of other extensions that they feel are similar to the current appeal and have been given approval by the Council. Most of these examples share limited similarity in the context of this appeal given they are located away from the specific characteristics and appearance of the appeal site. In my opinion, as I have explained in my decision, Mandeville Close retains a strong sense of character and appearance which the appeal scheme would conflict with.
15. In any case, I have considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits and the presence of these examples do not persuade me that the appeal proposal is acceptable or otherwise justify the harm that I have identified in respect of the scheme.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR