



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2025

by Robert Fallon B.Sc. (Hons) PGDipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/W/25/3366500

8 Roundmoor Drive, Cheshunt, Waltham Cross, Hertfordshire, EN8 9HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr I Elitok against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/24/0856/F.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “Proposed erection of two story back addition, single story side addition and conversion of extended and altered property into two family sized flats”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal makes adequate provision for off-road parking;
 - the living conditions of future occupiers, with particular regard to amenity space;
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Appeal site context

3. The appeal site consists of a post-WWII 2-storey semi-detached dwelling on a prominent corner plot which has been extended with a 2-storey side addition. The property lies perpendicular to the vehicular highway and faces a small public green, with its front garden enclosed by a low wall and mainly surfaced in block paving offering one/two off-road parking spaces.
4. Roundmoor Drive is characterised by single family dwellinghouses, consisting of mature 2-storey semi-detached dwellings and occasional 2-storey terraced blocks.

Whether the proposal makes adequate provision for off-road parking

5. Although the scheme would result in less than 2.5 spaces per flat as specified in the car-parking guidelines of the Local Plan¹, I am satisfied that the level of provision proposed would be adequate given the range of shops, services and public transport opportunities within reasonable walking and cycling distance of the

¹ The Broxbourne Local Plan, A framework for the future development of the Borough, June 2020, Local Plan 2018-2033, Borough of Broxbourne.

site. As a consequence, I am not of the view that it would be necessary for future occupiers to have, and be dependent on, private cars to meet their day to day needs. However, I do recognise that there would likely be an increase in overall numbers of cars parked on the road, but am of the view that this would not be so great as to increase parking stress levels to unacceptable limits.

6. The use of the existing vehicular access points at the front and rear of the site for off-road parking has not attracted any objections from the local highway authority on highway safety grounds. I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion as I found there to be sufficient visibility in both directions from each access point to enable a driver to see oncoming vehicles on this relatively quiet and unclassified residential road.
7. In view of the above, I conclude that the development would make adequate provision for off-road parking. The scheme would therefore accord with Policy TM5 of the Local Plan, which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure a sensible balance of car spaces based on the nature of the proposal, site context and accessibility of shops, services and sustainable transport infrastructure, with the aim of reducing private car use.
8. This conclusion accords with Paragraph 116 of the Framework² which states that development should only be prevented on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The living conditions of future occupiers, with particular regard to amenity space

9. The private amenity space to the front of the dwelling would serve the first floor 3-bedroom flat. By reason of this space being shared with the apartment's off road parking and driveway, there would only be a very small area available for private leisure purposes, which I would not consider adequate. This layout would be particularly harmful if the flat was occupied by families with small children as it would give rise to potentially dangerous conflicts between occupants and vehicles being manoeuvred into this space for parking.
10. The front garden would also be exposed to full public gaze by reason of the boundary treatment being restricted in height and not therefore give any privacy to those using it for private amenity purposes. I also have concerns that the absence of taller boundary treatment would result in a loss of privacy to the primary front ground floor window of the neighbouring property at No 6 Roundmoor Drive. I recognise that it would be possible to impose a condition requiring the installation of taller boundary treatment, but would not consider this acceptable in an area characterised by dwellings with front gardens that are enclosed by dwarf walls or left completely open.
11. The appellant states that there are other areas of open space nearby that could be used by occupants, including the public greenspace directly in front of the dwelling and that at Moxom Avenue. However, the presence of these would not overcome the need for a safe and private garden space for future occupiers of the first floor flat and their families, particularly those with small children.

² National Planning Policy Framework, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 12 December 2024 (as amended on 7 February 2025).

12. In view of the above, I conclude that the scheme would fail to provide an acceptable quantum and quality of amenity space for occupiers of the first floor flat. As a consequence, the development would conflict with Policy DSC1 of the Local Plan, which seeks, amongst other things, a high standard of design for all development.
13. I also find that the development would conflict with Paragraph 135 of the Framework which seeks, amongst other things, a high standard of amenity for future users.

The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area

14. The proposed 2-storey rear extension would be set below the main roof ridgeline and just inside the east facing side elevation, with a modest 3.0 metre projection from the north-facing rear elevation. As a consequence, it would have a subservient character and complement the design of the existing house.
15. However, the single storey side addition would project above the existing boundary wall and completely fill the 1.98 metre open gap between it and the side elevation of the property, which is an important feature of corner plots in the area and provides visual relief to the street scene by setting back built form from the pedestrian footway.
16. When compared with the use of the existing three/four bed property as a single family dwellinghouse, the proposal would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the area by reason of:- (1) increased comings and goings from two large 3-bed flats; (2) a potential increase in car ownership at the site and guests/visitors arriving in their own vehicles leading to a rise in on-street parking and pressure for additional parking in the rear garden; and (3) the amenity space to the front of the property potentially containing paraphernalia such as a rotary washing line, outdoor seating and children's play equipment & toys.
17. In view of the above, I conclude that the above matters, when taken cumulatively, would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, the development would conflict with Policy DSC1 of the Local Plan which seeks, amongst other things; (1) a high standard of design for all development; and (2) to enhance local character and distinctiveness, taking into account existing patterns of development, urban form, building lines and other setbacks.
18. For the same reasons, I also find that the scheme would conflict with Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the Framework which collectively seek, amongst other things; (a) development that is sympathetic to local character; (b) development that maintains a strong sense of place; and (c) the refusal of permission for development that is not well designed.
19. I also find that the scheme conflicts with the Council's design guidance referred to by the appellant which states at Paragraphs S1 and S2 that side extensions should be set at least 1.0 metre off the side boundary of the property and 1.0 metre off the front of the building³.

³ Appendix 3;– SPG 11/2020 House Extensions

Planning balance

20. I recognise that the scheme would result in benefits from; (a) a net-contribution of 1 dwelling towards the Council's 5-year housing land supply in a sustainable location; (b) future occupiers contributing to the vitality and viability of shops, services, facilities, businesses and community organisations in the surrounding area; and (c) local employment during construction. However, given that only one additional dwelling is proposed, I consider these benefits to be of limited value and that the adverse impacts of the scheme would outweigh these, when assessed against the policies in the development plan and other material considerations.
21. The appellant has referred to Paragraph 124 of the Framework in support of the scheme, which promotes an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes. However, this paragraph also states that this should be done alongside safeguarding & improving the environment and ensuring safe & healthy living conditions, which I have concluded the scheme does not on the basis of its harm to the character and appearance of the area and the creation of poor living conditions from an inadequate private amenity area.
22. The appellant has also referred to Paragraph 125 c) and d) of the Framework which relates to using brownfield land and promoting the development of under-utilised land and buildings. However, the appeal site is already being used for residential purposes in accordance with Paragraph 125 c) and I do not consider the current use of the land & building as a single family dwellinghouse to be under-utilised as referred to by subsection d).
23. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposal does not accord with the development plan and that other material considerations do not indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with this.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Fallon

INSPECTOR