

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3157327
68 Merryhills Drive, Enfield, EN2 7NZ

- 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 Stavrakis Gabriel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/00879/HOU, dated 1 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extensions; loft conversion; and alteration to existing front bay to convert to a square bay.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a relatively modest two storey detached dwelling, which is situated in a prominent corner position within a residential area. The area is characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings, many of which have been altered and extended. These include extensions at numbers 43 and 45 Lowther Drive, which the applicant considers to be similar to the appeal proposal in terms of the corner positions of the properties and the form and style of the extensions.
 4. The appeal proposal would significantly extend the width and depth of the existing dwelling, to create a double-fronted property with accommodation in the roofspace. The extended property would be set-in from the side boundary with Netherby Gardens by approximately 2.3m (according to the submitted plans). It would be no closer to this boundary than the existing single garage at the property. The overall height of the extended dwelling would be no higher than the existing main roof.
 5. Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 (CS) reflects the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) by seeking to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, and by
-

ensuring that new development is of high quality design with special regard to its context. In addition, Policy DMD 14 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (DMD), which relates to side extensions, states that proposals will be assessed with regard to the character of the area and the bulk/dominance of the extension on the street frontage and its subordination in relation to the existing dwelling.

6. The scale and mass of the proposed extensions are such that they could not be regarded as a subordinate addition to the property. However, this does not automatically mean that the proposal is unacceptable. In terms of the architectural design, I consider that the extensions are of high quality and the property would have a balanced and uniform appearance. Whilst the character and appearance of the dwelling would change significantly, I am not persuaded that the change would be unduly harmful in that regard.
7. However, in terms of the effect of the proposal on the streetscene, I consider that the development would create a dwelling that would appear as an overly large and highly dominant feature in its surroundings due to its scale, mass and prominent corner position. The dwelling would appear out of scale and proportion in relation to nearby properties and because of its elevated position above Netherby Gardens its prominence would be exacerbated. As such, it would appear out of context with this section of Merryhills Drive.
8. The Council has expressed concern that the extended property would project in front of the dwellings facing Netherby Gardens. However, given the separation distance between the appeal property and the nearest dwelling on Netherby Gardens, I am not persuaded that this relationship would be visually unacceptable.
9. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account other extensions that have been built (with the benefit of planning permission) locally. These include the extensions at 43 and 45 Lowther Drive and at 28 Merryhills Drive. I acknowledge that there are some similarities between these properties and the appeal proposal, in terms of corner plot positions, roof design and the scale of the extensions in relation to the original dwellings. However, each case must be determined on its merits having regard to the site and local characteristics. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that these other examples should act as a precedent for the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the streetscene and it would be contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, as referred to above. It is therefore concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR