The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2017

by Sue Glover BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3167592
6 Monks Close, Enfield, EN2 8DY

- 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 Florin Ciocan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application Ref 16/03851/HOU was refused by notice dated 12 October 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached bungalows and the surrounding area, and on the living conditions of the residents of no. 4 Monks Close in respect of outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. This part of the street is characterised by low level semi-detached bungalows set back from the street in a spacious suburban setting. No. 6 has been substantially altered at the rear with the original design of the modest sized bungalow subsumed by ground floor and roof extensions.

4. From the rear aspect, the bungalow has a horizontal emphasis and a large amount of glazing. With the bungalow at a lower level than the street, the rear extensions are not readily apparent and the bungalow at the front for the most part retains its original character.

5. However, the enlargement of the existing roof extension over part of a ground floor extension would elongate the flat profile of the roof line visible on the flank elevation from the street. It would create an excessively bulky and discordant feature as seen from the rear and side aspects of the bungalow. As such there would be material harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached bungalows and the surrounding area.

6. There would be conflict with Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 -2025 (CS), which indicates that developments must be high quality and have special regard to their context. There would also be conflict with Policy DMD 11 of the Development Management Document, which requires no adverse visual impact, with Policy DMD 13 that seeks to ensure that roof extensions must not disrupt the character or balance of the property, and with Policy DMD 37 that seeks to resist any development that is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings.

7. I also find that the proposal conflicts with the objectives of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, the Spatial Strategy for London, consolidated with Alterations since 2011. These policies require a high quality of design appropriate to its context.

8. The development plan objectives are consistent with those set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraphs 17 and 60 seek to secure a high quality of design, and to reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposal does not meet the objectives of the Framework in these respects.

Living conditions

9. The attached bungalow at no. 4 is dominated by the flank wall of the existing ground floor extension on the shared common boundary. The proposal would increase the height of the existing flank wall with a roof extension over 5m in height. The proposal would appear excessively dominating and exacerbate a sense of enclosure close to habitable room windows and a patio area at no. 4, thereby harming residents' outlook.

10. There would also be a reduction in daylight into nearby windows from the higher flank boundary wall. However, as the rear gardens are north facing there would not be any significant effect on the amount of sunlight received. To conclude on this issue, there would be significant harm to the living conditions of the residents of no. 4 Monks Close in respect of outlook and daylight.

11. There would be an inappropriate scale and form of development contrary to Policy DMD 6 and the proposal would appear dominating from no. 4 contrary to Policy DMD 13. I also find conflict with Policy DMD 8 that expects all development to preserve amenity including daylight and outlook, with Policy DMD 37 that seeks to achieve high quality design, and with DMD 11 that requires no impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

12. There is also conflict with CS Core Policy 30, which seeks to ensure that development actively enhances the quality of life experience by both existing and future residents. The development plan policies are consistent with paragraph 17 of the Framework, which indicates that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. There is conflict with the Framework in this respect.

Other matters and conclusions

13. There is sufficient separation from the adjacent dwelling at no. 8 so that there would be no material harm to these residents' living conditions. There are other extensions in the vicinity, including at no. 1, but I have judged this proposal on its own individual merits.

14. I have taken into account all other matters, including the appellant's desire for more living space to accommodate his family. I have also considered all the

policies in the Framework, and other national planning policy and guidance. Notwithstanding my findings in respect of the other matters, the harm that I have identified to character and appearance and to residents' living conditions at no. 4 is significant and overriding. The appeal therefore does not succeed.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR