

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3157844
19 Old Park Road South, Enfield EN2 7DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bob Chamberlain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/02368/HOU, dated 24 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed side extension and roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues for the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Old Park Road South, with particular reference to any effects upon outlook and /or increased sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a relatively steeply pitched hipped roof and is situated within a small group of bungalows on Old Park Road South. I saw at my site visit the variety in the scale and design of the detached and semi-detached dwellings on the street.
 4. The appeal proposal would add a second floor to the building which would be accommodated within gabled additions to the front and rear and through the provision of a crown roof. The gabled elements would marginally exceed the height of the existing roof.
 5. The appearance of the dwelling would change substantially in the street scene from a modest single storey bungalow to a relatively large building of a one and a half storey appearance. Whilst the front gable projection would not extend beyond the existing single storey garage and building line, it would introduce a significant structure, which in terms of its bulk, would dominate the front elevation of the dwelling. The proposed extensions would also give rise to an excessive depth of flank walls visible within the street scene. Consequently,
-

this element of the building would not appear as subordinate to the original dwelling and would also be out of scale with the bungalows to either side and would not improve the appearance of the host dwelling.

6. I have considered the comments that front projecting gables are already found on the street such as at 13 Old Park Road South, which is of a similar appearance to that proposed. I am not aware however of the detailed circumstances of that development and saw at my site visit that No 13 is set below the level of the road and is read in the context of a considerably larger dwelling to one side. At my site visit I also observed 23 Old Park Road South which has been referred to me by the appellant. Whilst I have not been provided with full details of the works which have been undertaken, I did note that the building retains the appearance of a bungalow in the streetscene.
7. I have considered that the proposal would maintain adequate gaps with neighbouring dwellings, that the rear dormer is set back from the eaves and that the proposal would meet policy requirements in these regards. I have also been referred to paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) regarding architectural styles and local distinctiveness, but nevertheless have found the proposed alterations to be harmful.
8. To conclude on this matter, the appeal proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is contrary therefore to Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (Core Strategy) which is concerned with maintaining and improving the quality of the built environment. It also conflicts with the Enfield Development Management Document November 2014 (DMD) Policy DMD8 which sets general standards for new residential development including that development must be of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing. The proposal also conflicts with DMD Policy DMD11 which is concerned with rear extensions, DMD Policies DMD13 and DMD 14 which are concerned with roof and side extensions respectively and DMD Policy DMD 37 which is concerned with achieving high quality design.

Living conditions

9. The appeal scheme includes projecting gables to the front and rear of the property. These would be constructed over the site of a car port and single storey elements which I saw at my site visit have been demolished. The projecting gable would extend beyond the back of the neighbouring 21 Old Park Road South, presenting a length of flank wall and roof towards the garden of No 21. A modest separation gap would be retained between the proposed extensions and No 21 either side of the common boundary.
10. With regards to outlook, although the two storey element of the scheme falls marginally within a 30 degree line taken from the neighbouring No 21, the appeal scheme would not have unacceptable effects for the occupiers of No 21, as the principal outlook towards the open land beyond the garden would be largely unaffected. Given the existing open character of the rear gardens, the separation gap and the relatively limited extent that the flank wall would project beyond of the rear of No 21, I do not consider that an unacceptable sense of enclosure would arise for the occupiers of No 21. Additionally, I do not consider that the appeal scheme would be of such a scale so as to be overly dominant or obtrusive for the occupiers of No 21 in terms of their living conditions.

11. In this regard, the appeal proposal does not conflict in part with Core Strategy Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan 2010-2025. It also does not conflict in part with DMD Policies DMD 8, DMD 13, DMD 14 and DMD 37. Whilst the appeal proposal conflicts with DMD Policy DMD 11 in that the rear two storey extension would fall marginally within a 30 degree line drawn from the neighbouring property, this would not give rise to significant harm. The appeal proposal also does not conflict in this regard with the Framework which states in paragraph 17 that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. However, my findings on this matter do not outweigh those in respect of character and appearance.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR