



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2025

by **A Hickey MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 JULY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/W/25/3360371

22 Benford Road, Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire EN11 8LL

- 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 Andrew Trigger against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/24/0257/F.
 - The development proposed is construction of new 2 bed dwelling with associated parking and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development and site address above from the application form. Although different to that given on the decision notice, no confirmation has been provided that a change was agreed.
3. Amended plans¹ were considered by the Council prior to the determination of the planning application. I have considered the appeal on the basis of these amended plans.
4. My attention has been drawn to previous appeals on the site². Whilst I have considered the present appeal on the merits of the case, I have had regard to the other Inspectors' findings insofar as they are relevant to the matter in dispute.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to the Council's House extensions, conversions and driveways supplementary planning guidance. As the appeal scheme proposes a new dwelling, I have had regard to it only in so far as it seeks a high standard of design for all development in combination with Policy DSC1 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (BLP).

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The site is located within a predominantly residential area comprising mainly detached dwellings and bungalows. The appeal site occupies a corner plot and historically formed part of the curtilage of 22 Benford Road. While there are some

¹ Plan no's: ELA/1 rev. A, ELA/3 rev. C, ELA/5 rev. C, ELA/6 rev. B, ELA/14 rev. C, ELA/15 rev. B and ELA/17 rev. A

² Appeal refs: APP/W1905/W/20/3257714 and APP/W1905/W/22/3291886

nearby bungalows, properties on this side of Benford Road, closest to the appeal site, are two-storey. Despite some limited alterations and extensions, these dwellings have a generally consistent architectural rhythm with similar scale and roof orientation facing the road.

8. The proposed development would respect the building line on this side of the road. However, it would introduce a bungalow sandwiched between two two-storey dwellings, which would be at odds with the scale of properties on this section of the road. While the scheme has sought to utilise the site topography, this does not overcome the awkward visual relationship between the dwellings on either side that would exist on this prominent junction location.
9. There are bungalows of differing designs within the wider area including at No 34. However, the gable-fronted orientation of the proposed bungalow would jar with the roof styles of the adjacent properties, introducing an incongruous form of development to this part of the street scene.
10. Given my findings above, a condition on materials to be agreed by the Council would not overcome the harms identified above.
11. For the above reasons, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is a conflict with Policy DSC1 of the BLP, which, among other things, seeks to achieve a high standard design that takes into account existing patterns of development, urban form, and building typology.

Other Matters

12. The overturning of the officer's recommendation is acknowledged. Nonetheless, I have found that harm would occur to the character and appearance of the area, having considered the scheme on its own merits.
13. No substantial evidence of how the appellant has sought to engage with the Council, such as pre-application engagement, is before me. In any event, this detail would have been unlikely to outweigh the harms outlined above.
14. A lack of harm in other regards including to highways and neighbouring properties is a neutral factor weighing neither for nor against the development.
15. There is no objection in principle to the development of the site for a dwelling. Additionally, the proposal, although small, would make a contribution to the Council's housing target on a previously developed site in a sustainable location. Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
17. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR