
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 28 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3180416

34 Chestnut Close, Southgate, London N14 4SD

- 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 Aziz Pinar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/00984/HOU, dated 27 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area, and on the living conditions of 36 Chestnut Close, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large semi-detached dwelling with window and decorative features characteristic of an interwar style house. Similar style houses on sloping ground over shallow hills and dips characterise the wider area. The appeal property has been extended several times previously, as has the adjoining semi-detached, resulting in rear L shapes to the pair of dwellings, indicating that the Council's view of local style variation is not prescriptive.
4. A side extension is proposed at first floor level that would overhang the ground floor at the rear and have a deep projecting eave to a part mono pitch tiled roof along the side. No 32 is a two storey property more reflective of the original size of the dwellings, its rear is occupied by a single storey projection that is slightly set down from the land levels at No 34, which would increase the contrast between the two adjacent properties further. The side extension would sit awkwardly in the front elevation and due to the increase in overall bulk and the rear overhang at first floor level, the development as a whole would appear top heavy and dominate the side and rear elevation in particular. It would also create a disruptive and incongruous feature by the Juliet balcony and overhang to the rear. These aspects of the proposed development would be unsympathetic and considerably harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

5. With regard to No 36, although both of the semi-detached dwellings have had roof and rear extensions, the proposed longer overhanging projection to the rear at No 34 would cut across the outlook from the rear windows of No 36. This would be in breach of the 30 degree angle from the original first floor rear windows set out in the London Borough of Enfield's 2014 Development Management Document DMD11. The new extension would also be bulky and prominent. However, due to the L shaped configuration of the rear extensions at both properties in the pair of semi-detached dwellings, the proposed rear extension would not directly adjoin the boundary but be separated by a reasonable distance of several metres. The properties also occupy relatively open elevated positions on higher ground at the rear with sloping gardens which would allow good quality lightfall generally from the south and east. I consider that notwithstanding the technical breach of the line of sight outlined above, due to the separation distance between the new extension and No 36 the development would not have particularly overbearing effect on No 36 and would have a significantly harmful effect on light and outlook.
6. Despite the fact that I conclude there would be no significant harm to the living conditions of No 36 with regard to light and outlook, due to the identified harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area, I conclude that the development would conflict with the London Borough of Enfield's 2014 Development Management Document Policies DMD 11, DMD14 and DMD37, and Core Strategy Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025 which seek to secure high quality development that reflects its surroundings.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR