



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/25/3369750

11 Marina Gardens, Cheshunt, Hertfordshire EN8 9QZ

- 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 Lee Wall against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/25/0268/HF.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft conversion with side and rear dormers and rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The site visit was undertaken on an unaccompanied basis with the assessment of the appeal being based upon what could be seen from public viewpoints and the submitted drawings.

Main Issues

3. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 11A Marina Gardens.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is an altered semi-detached 2-storey dwelling situated within a primarily residential area comprising properties of a similar type and design. 11A Marina Gardens, which neighbours the property, is an exception because it is a modest sized detached dwelling.
5. As identified by the appellant, some of the semi-detached dwellings fronting Marina Gardens have been altered, including by the erection of dormer extensions within the side roofslopes. Although the planning history of these other schemes has not been provided, these dormer extensions are visible from the road and contribute to the character and appearance of the streetscene, albeit because of their size and design this contribution is not always positive.

6. The appellant identifies that the previous 2-storey side addition has created a large roofspace with poor head height. The proposed dormer extension would enable the effective use of this space for habitable accommodation. This proposed extension would be set up from the eaves, set down from the roof's ridge and set back from the front and rear 2-storey gable features.
7. Unlike other dormer extensions seen from the road, the appeal scheme would not be contained solely within the side roofslope but would wrap around the front and rear roof slopes of the 2-storey addition and the original property. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would possess an extensive flat roof. There would also a large cheek of the dormer sited within the front roof slope facing towards the road. This cheek would not include any openings.
8. By reason of its scale, from the road the proposed extension would have a bulky appearance and thereby significantly altering the character of this already extended property. Although it would be set down from the ridge, up from eaves and rearwards of the front/rear gables, because of its design and bulk the appeal scheme would have the appearance of a third storey being added to the property. The extensive cheek of the dormer and the absence of any openings would accentuate its bulk and the 3-storey appearance of the resulting dwelling. For these reasons, the scale and bulk of the resulting property would be a conspicuous feature within the streetscene.
9. Further, the design and bulk of the resulting property would fail to respect the character and appearance of the existing 2-storey semi-detached dwellings fronting the road, including those which have been altered by the erection of side dormer extensions. Accordingly, the resulting property would be an incongruous addition to the streetscene. The identified unacceptable harm caused to the host property and the streetscene would not be adequately mitigated by the use of matching external materials to construct the appeal scheme.
10. On this issue, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan (LP). Amongst other matters, these policies expect a high standard of design for all development, including by taking into account patterns of development, building typology and details such as roof form and fenestration. Further, all extensions should respect the character and design of the host building, including by ensuring that their scale, design and external appearance of the resulting property would not unduly impact upon the parent building and wider setting.

Living Conditions

11. As observed during the site visit, the side elevation of the proposed dormer extension would face towards the shared boundary with 11A Marina Gardens and this neighbouring dwelling's flank wall. There are no openings within the flank wall of No. 11A.
12. By reason of siting and bulk, the proposed development would be visible from the rear garden of No. 11A. However, because of the degree of separation between the property and No. 11A the appeal scheme would not be such an overbearing form of development to justify this appeal failing.

13. Within the proposed extension's side elevation would be 3-bedroom windows. Two of these windows would have an outlook predominantly towards the roof or front garden of No. 11A. However, 1 window would have an outlook, at least in part, towards the rear garden of No. 11A. For this reason, and as noted by the local residents and assessed from the submitted drawings, this overlooking of the rear garden of No. 11A would result in a loss of privacy to the occupiers of this neighbouring property.
14. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 11A Marina Gardens and, as such, it would be contrary to LP Policy EQ1 which requires proposals for development within the urban area to avoid detrimental impacts on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring properties, including by reason of overlooking.
15. Although the proposed development would create additional habitable accommodation within the roofspace, this matter is judged to be outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR