
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2016

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/16/3158374
88 Beaconsfield Road, Enfield EN3 6AP

- 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 Angelo Evangelou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 15/04417/FUL, dated 26 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of an existing house into 2 houses including extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant does not agree with the description of development used by the Council as reference is made to flats when he considers that the proposal would create two houses. I have used the description of development from the appellant's planning application form as this suitably describes the proposal. Whether the proposal constitutes the creation of flats or houses is, in any event, not a determinative matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey end of terrace dwelling with a rear garden. There is open land to the side of the property which separates the appeal dwelling from No 92 Beaconsfield Road which is a semi-detached house. The area is predominantly residential in character and appearance: there is a mixture of semi-detached, terraced and detached houses on Beaconsfield Road, some of which have been extended.
5. It is proposed to sub-divide the appeal property into two residential units, one with two bedrooms and one with three bedrooms. Each of the residential properties would have its own separate entrance, and the existing rear garden would be split into two so that each residence would have its own outside amenity space measuring respectively about 23 square metres and 33 square

- metres. The proposal also includes the erection of a two storey side /rear extension, a single storey rear extension and a rear roof dormer.
6. The two storey side extension would be built approximately 1 metre from the boundary with No 92 Beaconsfield Road. In this respect the proposal would accord with Policy DMD 14 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) which states that *"a minimum distance of 1 metre from the boundary with adjoining property should be maintained. A greater distance may be required depending on the size and nature of the residential plots, and to prevent adverse impacts on the street-scene and residential amenity"*. In this case, I consider that the 1 metre separation would be acceptable.
 7. Spaces between existing blocks of residential properties in Beaconsfield Road tend to be relatively narrow and so the proposal would not appear out of place in this regard. In addition, I agree with the Council that the position of the side extension relative to No 92 Beaconsfield Road (which is set back from the appeal property) is such that there would not be any unacceptable residential amenity impacts (subject to the imposition of planning conditions). I also note that there is a similar extension to the end of the terrace dwelling at No 104 Beaconsfield Road. I conclude that the two storey side extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 8. The rear extension would include a "butterfly roof" at first floor level and would extend beyond the existing rear building wall at first floor level by approximately 700mm. I consider that this part of the proposal would look out of place on the host property and would not reflect the style and appearance of development to the rear of dwellings in the immediate locality. I note that the appellant considers that this development would not be conspicuous from the street-scene, but it would be visible and incongruous when viewed from surrounding residential gardens and there would be glimpses of it from parts of Uckfield Road. I conclude that this development would appear out of place within the rest of the terrace and would therefore not accord with Policy DMD 11 of the DMD which states that *"first floor extensions must where appropriate secure a common alignment of rear extensions"*.
 9. The proposed rear dormer would be large in so far that it would also extend across the rear roof of the proposed two storey side extension. It would accord with Policy DMD13 of the DMD in respect of how far it would be inset from the edges of the roof. However, it would fall considerably short of the required 500mm – 700mm inset distance from the ridge and eaves of the roof. Consequently, the dormer would appear dominant and out of proportion on the appeal property. This harm would be compounded by the fact that the dormer would be wide (given the proposed side extension) and as most of the existing roofs in the immediate area are unbroken. When viewed from surrounding gardens, and from parts of Uckfield Road, the dormer would look out of place within its urban setting. Therefore, I conclude that the dormer would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 10. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the aforementioned extensions would cause significant harm to the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with the design aims of Policy CS30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies DMD 11, DMD 13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the DMD.

Other Matters

11. I have no reason to disagree with the conclusions reached by the Council that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in respect of outlook, light and privacy, that the outside amenity areas and internal floorspace standards would accord with planning policy requirements, and that as three bedroom residential accommodation is proposed there would be no conflict with Policy DMD5 of the DMD. I also acknowledge that the proposed single storey rear extension would be acceptable in terms of the maximum 3 metre depth permitted by Policy DMD11 of the DMD.
12. I note that the provision of a net additional one dwelling would contribute to the supply of housing in the Borough of Enfield. However, the contribution from one dwelling would be limited.
13. Whilst there are some other dormers in the wider locality which are relatively large, I do not know the exact circumstances which led to these being constructed. In any event, I have considered the effect of the proposed dormer upon the host dwelling and the immediate character and appearance of the locality.
14. I have carefully considered the other matters raised, but none are weighty enough to overcome my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR