The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by Mike Fox BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3166522
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 16/04948/HOU, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
- The development proposed is single storey rear and side extension, 2x side dormers, patio doors, balustrade and rear terrace and alterations to roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modestly proportioned detached bungalow, currently not lived in and which has experienced some demolition on its south-east flank, facing no. 21. It is situated on the brow of a gentle hill within a well landscaped and established residential area and borders a golf course to the rear. The properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property are bungalows and with one exception (at no. 23) they have striking pitched roofs. Although the roof design of these bungalows is not entirely uniform they combine to reveal a pleasant cadence in their heights, and critically, nearly all the roofs, including those nearest to the appeal property, rise to a 'pyramid' style single point; this latter feature is a key element in the character and appearance of the streetscene.

4. The proposed development, through the addition of the roof dormers, the increased gable over the relocated garage and the removal of the triangular point at the top of the roof, would combine to change the profile of the property to a top heavy, horizontal emphasis. This would look contrived, with little visual cohesion between the disparate elements of the multi-faceted roof lines, and this would break the settled continuity of neighbouring bungalows and be at odds with their attractive roof designs. Furthermore, the lateral spread of the front elevation would result in the bulk of the building being

significantly out of proportion to its neighbours, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the streetscene.

5. From my site observation, I agree with the Council that the south-east facing dormer would be highly visible in the streetscene, reinforced by the uphill gradient in the road. Taking all of these points into consideration, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would harm the modestly proportioned character and distinctive appearance of the existing house and would disrupt the settled character of the streetscene at a critical point on the brow of a hill. As such it would be contrary to national policy, as expressed in section 7 of *the Framework*[1], which promotes good design, and to policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy, which requires high quality designed development which has appropriate regard to its surroundings.

6. The Appellant has reduced both the massing along the boundary with no. 21 and the forward projection towards the road, following the loss at appeal of an earlier proposal[2]. These changes, which are undoubtedly improvements over the earlier scheme, do not, however, in my view overcome the reasons that led the previous Inspector to dismiss the appeal before him, and neither do they, in my view, make the scheme acceptable in terms of its visual impact in relation to the appeal before me.

7. In conclusion, I have found that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of both the existing appeal property and the streetscene. This would be contrary to the national policy and the development plan. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Mike Fox

INSPECTOR

[1] DCLG: National Planning Policy Framework (*the Framework*); March 2012.
[2] APP/Q5300/D/16/3157844; dated 26 October 2016.