



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: 18 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/24/3352736

36 Little Stock Road, Cheshunt, Hertfordshire EN7 6XU

- 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 Michael Perkins against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/24/0350/HF.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is described in the application form as “double side extension”. In the interests of clarity and precision I have used the Council’s description of development from its decision notice in the banner heading of my decision which more accurately describes the proposed development.
3. The Council’s second reason for refusal refers to the impact of the proposed development on a parking space associated with 34 Little Stock Road. However, I have evidence before me from third parties and the appellant demonstrating that this parking space is associated with 69 Little Stock Road rather than No 34. My decision will therefore reflect that this parking space is associated with No 69 rather than No 34.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - a) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and area.
 - b) The effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The area predominantly comprises short terraces of two-storey properties finished with a variety of brick colours. Properties are organised in a uniform pattern following a stepped building line. Houses are set back from the road with open frontages occupied predominantly by driveways or parking courts. The area has a suburban character and appearance.

6. 36 Little Stock Road is an end of terrace two-bedroom property which is situated adjacent to a turning head near the end of Little Stock Road. Whilst gaps between properties within Little Stock Road are usually narrow, the larger gap between No 34 and No 36 is influenced by the road ending between these properties. Similar arrangements are seen throughout the area where the ends of roads do not directly front onto properties. In this regard, the appeal site positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area through this gap.
7. The proposed two storey extension would be set back from the front building line of No 36 and the ridge would be set down from the existing ridge. The proportions and style of the extension would appear similar to others seen within the streetscene.
8. However, the extension would introduce two-storey built form into the gap at the end of Little Stock Road and would diminish the gap which positively contributes to the character and appearance of this end-of-road plot. Furthermore, an extension directly fronting onto the end of the highway would appear as an overdevelopment of the plot and out of character with the pattern of development. I find that this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property and streetscene.
9. Furthermore, I find that the proposed ground floor window on the front elevation would be out of keeping with the windows on the existing property due to its excessive length. This would make the fenestration appear unbalanced on No 36 within the streetscene and as a result would be harmful to the character and appearance of No 36 and the area.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As a result, the proposed development would conflict with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (2020) which seek to ensure that development is of a high standard that enhances local character and distinctiveness, along with respecting the character and design of the host building.

Highway Safety

11. The parking arrangements for the properties in Little Stock Road involve designated spaces situated in parking courts, driveways or within integral garages. Whilst Little Stock Road is not subject to on-road parking restrictions, due to the pattern of development, there are minimal gaps between driveways meaning there is limited opportunity for non-designated parking within the area.
12. The appeal site currently comprises a two-bedroom property with two allocated parking spaces. The proposal would result in the loss of the side parking space and the addition of a bedroom. The proposed development would therefore result in a three-bedroom property with a single parking space.
13. The Council's Parking Guidelines contained within Appendix B of the Broxbourne Local Plan (2020) recommends that 3-bedroom properties should have 2.5 allocated on-site parking spaces. The proposal therefore results in a shortfall of 1.5 parking spaces at No 36.
14. I have not been presented with evidence to demonstrate how this shortfall of parking at No 36 would be accommodated within the local area. As such, I cannot conclude that the proposed development would provide an appropriate level of parking that would avoid material harm to the safety of other road users and pedestrians.

15. In relation to the effect on the adjacent space serving No 69, the appellant has stated that it is not used by the current occupier and the parking space is unsuitable for parking vehicles larger than a motorcycle due to a verge located adjacent to the space and the overall size of the space. I have not, however, been provided with any substantive evidence demonstrating this.
16. As such, I cannot conclude that this parking space is unusable and does not benefit No 69 and contribute to the wider parking arrangements of Little Stock Road. Furthermore, whilst the current occupier of No 69 may not frequently utilise the space, this does not mean that they, or a future occupier, would not use this parking space in the future.
17. I also have not been provided with any substantive information demonstrating how the proposed extension would impact the operation of the parking space serving No 69 and if it could continue to be used safely, once the extension is built owing to its proximity to the space and the need to raise the dropped kerb. If the space became unusable, it has also not been demonstrated how this loss of parking could be accommodated in the wider area.
18. As such, I cannot conclude that the proposed development would not adversely affect the safe operation of the adjacent parking space and that an appropriate level of parking would be provided to No 69 that would avoid material harm to the safety of other road users and pedestrians.
19. For the reasons that I have given, there is insufficient information in relation to the host property and No 69 to determine that the proposal would provide sufficient parking and not cause an unacceptable impact to the safety of future pedestrians and road users. I therefore find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework with specific reference to paragraph 116. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy TM5 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (2020). This policy seeks to achieve appropriate parking provisions based on the nature of the proposal, site context and wider surrounding area.

Other Matters

20. The appellant has identified that properties within Little Stock Road have converted their integral garages to living accommodation and therefore have lost their own parking spaces. However, No 36 does not have a garage which could be converted and therefore is of limited relevance. Furthermore, rather than providing justification for the development in question, the potential loss of parking spaces within the wider estate points to a need for the loss of parking to be carefully controlled if the safety of the area is to be safeguarded.
21. Furthermore, I have been supplied with limited information with regard to these examples as to whether planning permission has been obtained or the context of these developments in comparison to the appeal proposal. As such, a comparison is of limited relevance in this instance.
22. The appellant has also suggested that an alternative extension could be carried out under permitted development, which would result in the loss of the parking space. However, other than an unscaled screenshot of a floor plan contained within the evidence of the appellant, I have little evidence to support this claim. I am therefore unable to conclude that this offers a realistic or probable prospect and consequently it does not represent a fallback position to which I can attach more than limited

weight to. It is open to the appellant to apply to have the matter determined under Sections 191 or 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Any such determination would be unaffected by the outcome of this appeal. I have considered the appeal on the basis of what is proposed and its consequent effects.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR