



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2019

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/3224865
25 Merryhills Drive, Enfield EN2 7NS

- 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 and Mrs Vallabh against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 18/03604/HOU, dated 28 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is ground floor and first floor extensions. Loft conversion. Proposed outbuilding to rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council requested that I view the appeal site from the neighbouring properties of 23 and 27 Merryhills Drive. On my site visit I viewed the appeal site from the rear garden of No 27 but I was unable to gain access to No 23. However, I am satisfied that I am able to properly consider the proposed development on the basis of my site visit.
3. The Council and the appellant have submitted conflicting information regarding the approved details of the extensions to adjoining dwelling, No 23 Merryhills Drive. I therefore requested copies of the approved plans for No 23 (ref: 14/03740/HOU) from the Council, in order to allow me to properly consider the proposed development in front of me.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are;
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 23 Merryhills Drive, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Merryhills Drive is characterised by semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. The scheme proposes a first floor gable ended side extension, which would fail to reflect the design of the existing dwelling and other properties within the area, including the approved hipped roof side extension to No 23. The bulk and design of the proposed extension would create an overly dominant design feature which would harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the street scene.
6. The scheme also proposes a first floor rear projection. I note that it has a hipped roof which would be set down below the ridge of the existing property and therefore responds to the design of the existing dwelling. However, given its depth, and when viewed in conjunction with the proposed two storey side extension, the overall mass of this structure would be overly dominant when viewed from No 27. It would therefore harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area.
7. I saw that the adjoining semi-detached property has recently been extended and currently includes a part hipped, part gable end roof design. However, I note that the Council considers that these works are unauthorised and that they are currently being investigated by the Council's Enforcement Team. There is therefore no certainty that the works to the adjoining property will be retained in their current form, and based on the evidence before me this matter does not therefore weigh in favour of this appeal at this time.
8. I conclude that due to its bulk and design the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) (LP), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) (CS) and Policies DMD13 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD)(2014) which, taken together, seek to secure good quality design which is in-keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and area.

Living conditions

9. Due to its depth, the proposed first floor rear extension would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to the first floor rear window of No 23, particularly when viewed in the context of the adjacent first floor extension of No 23 (in regards to both its current and approved forms). Due to its scale and orientation, the scheme would also reduce the level of daylight received by No 23 which adds to my concern in respect of an overbearing and enclosing effect on outlook. Consequently, in my view, the proposal would unacceptably impact upon the neighbour's living conditions.
10. I note that a first floor rear extension has recently been constructed to the adjoining property, which is of a similar depth to that being proposed. However, I note that this is also subject to investigation by the Council's Enforcement Team, and for the reasons stated previously this matter does not weigh in favour of the appeal.
11. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposal would lead to undue harm to the living conditions of residents of No 23 with regards to light and outlook. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the LP, Policy CP30 of the CS and Policy DMD11 of the DMD which, taken together, seek to secure good quality design which would not harm the living conditions of residents.

Other matters

12. I have considered other examples of house extensions in the area cited by the appellant. However, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. As such, I have found the appeal proposal would result in significant harm upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and area and to living conditions.

Conclusion

13. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal should be allowed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR