



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/25/3371726

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 the Borough of Broxbourne.
 - The application Ref. is 07/25/0060/HF.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension; garage conversion; front canopy, and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension; garage conversion; front canopy, and alterations to fenestration at 23 Mandeville Close, Broxbourne, Hertfordshire EN10 7PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 07/25/0060/HF and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. ELA/1 Rev. A; ELA/2 Rev. A; ELA/3 Rev. C; ELA/6 Rev. C; ELA/9 Rev. B; ELA/13 Rev. C; ELA/14 Rev. C; ELA/17 Rev. A.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's Notice of Refusal refers to Drawing No. ELA/9 Rev. A as one of the application plans, whereas the correct reference is ELA/9 Rev. B (in both cases 'Street View').

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Mandeville Close.

Reasons

4. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is part of a second half C20th residential estate development. As was the practice with such estates, the dwelling is one of several formulaic 'house types' proposed by the then developer amongst other

standard house designs for the estate. The asymmetrical roof pitch combined with the more commonplace large stone-clad chimney stack gives the building a distinctive identity, albeit some of the features and external materials are evident in the designs of other houses nearby.

5. With the passage of time, it is inevitable that householders will seek planning permission for alterations and additions to reflect their needs, more often than not additional floorspace. However, whilst it is reasonable for the Council in its role as a Local Planning Authority to accede to such requests where possible, the variety of house types, plot sizes, sitings and orientations inevitably act as a constraint on proposals that would incrementally undermine the integrity of the original estate's layout and design and thereby its character and appearance.
6. It is with these factors in mind that I have considered the revised proposed following the appeal dismissed in March of this year. I agree with my colleague Inspector as regards his analysis and findings and I am of the view that this initial proposal would have unacceptably breached the constraints, with the resultant adverse consequences I refer to in the preceding paragraph.
7. However, the amended scheme in this appeal is a more respectful proposal as regards its effect on the host dwelling and its setting within the estate. Importantly, the catslide roof, the most important distinguishing figure of this house type, would be retained. The removal of the large chimney would on balance be acceptable given its regular occurrence within the estate.
8. The scheme makes a more efficient use of the site by proposing a larger lounge within the currently external recessed frontage area. And because this addition does not alter the roof line, the extra accommodation has been achieved without harming the building's positive contribution to the streetscene. Furthermore, the proposal is preferable in aesthetic terms to the fallback situation under permitted development.
9. I have a reservation as regards the steep angle of the porch roof as I consider it to be jarring when seen in conjunction with the slope and apex of the roof. However, this objection is insufficient to justify withholding permission through the dismissal of the appeal.
10. Overall, I find that the amended proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Mandeville Close. Accordingly, there would be no harmful conflict with Policies DSC1 and DSC2 of the Broxbourne Local Plan 2020, or with Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.
11. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring matching external materials will preserve visual amenity, whilst a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR