



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3236594

16 Slades Hill, Enfield, England EN2 7DH

- 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 Dr S Saboor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/01715/HOU, dated 25 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed double storey front, first floor sides and rear and roof extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 14A and 16A Slades Hill with specific regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is located on the southern side of Slades Hill. The appeal site is a modern detached house set in relatively generous grounds which has been previously extended. The dwellings along the southern side of the road noticeably follow the fall of the hill with a stagger in ridgeline heights and are varied in type, styles and age.
4. Currently, the irregular building pattern to the front of the dwelling together with its combination of roof types including flat roofs, reflects the design characteristics of the other neighbouring houses at 14 and 14A Slades Hill. The similar characteristics of these three houses therefore appear as a set of houses within a street scene of varied character.
5. The extensions proposed would extend the dwelling to all four sides, significantly increasing the size of the host property with a single roof form above.

6. The combined excessive scale of extensions proposed would be disproportionately larger than the host dwelling and would not complement the proportions of the original house. Rather, the proposed extensions would dominate the host property and detract from the visual appearance of the more modest scale of the host property, significantly altering the appearance and integrity of the dwelling, therefore losing its original identity. Furthermore, the appearance of the three houses as a set would be compromised by the proposal as the appeal dwelling would appear as substantially larger, visually prominent and out of character, when compared with this group of similar houses.
7. It is accepted that differing roof types are part of the character of the area, however, the proposed roof would introduce a discordant and incongruous feature to the host dwelling that would be out of character, as it would appear as a bulky top-heavy mass. Furthermore, the proposed height of the ridge line would exceed that of No. 14A. The houses on the southern side of the road step down the hill due to the topography of the land, and a higher ridge line in this location would appear even more pronounced and uncharacteristic within the street scene given the neighbouring dwelling of 16A is a bungalow. Therefore, taking into account this proposed roof form, together with the introduction of a higher ridge line, would be visually intrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. The combination of factors would therefore create a development that not appear subordinate nor would it be a sympathetic addition to the dwelling and would not make a positive contribution to its character. This would in turn be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to the fact that there are larger houses close to the appeal site, including differing patterns of development and character. However, I find no other developments comparable to the appeal dwelling, and despite the use of matching materials, I am not persuaded that this outweighs the harm I have identified.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not accord with Policy 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010-2015) and policies DMD 6, DMD 11, DMD 14 and DMD 37 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD) (2014) that collectively, and amongst other considerations, seeks development to be of high quality design, of an appropriate scale and form, has regard to local character as well as ensuring extensions do not have an adverse impact on the original building and street scene. In addition, the proposal conflicts with the London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 that reflects the Council's aspirations for development to secure high quality design. Finally, the proposal would conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Living Conditions

11. In respect of the living conditions of No. 14A, the extension to the side would extend closer to the party boundary than currently exists with a projecting first floor element. However, the extent of this projection would not significantly compromise the outlook from the closest windows of No. 14A at ground and first floor due to the limited extent of the extension and the relationship between the two properties.

12. DMD Policy DMD 11 explains that first floor extensions must not exceed a line taken 30 degrees from the mid-point of the nearest first floor window to any of the adjacent properties. The proposed rear extension with a projection of approximately 3.79m beyond the existing rear elevation of No. 14A, its height, scale and massing, would reduce the outlook from the closest rear first-floor window. As a result of such, the occupiers living conditions would be harmed; although any impact of the proposal to the side wall window is unlikely to be significant as I understand it serves a landing.
13. With regard to Number 16A Slades Hill, a gap of approximately 1m would be retained between the two dwellings. A two-storey extension would project closer to the boundary than exists and would extend beyond this neighbour's rear building line by more than 7m. Given the close relationship of the two properties, taken together with the land level changes, the proposal's height scale and massing would therefore significantly harm the outlook from the rear elevation of this property, creating an overbearing sense of enclosure and reduced sun light levels to the rear of the dwelling and its small rear garden for a significant portion of the day.
14. Given the effect of the proposal on these occupiers' living conditions, the proposal would therefore be contrary to DMD policies DMD 6 and DMD 8 for new development to be of an appropriate scale, form and bulk that preserves amenity in terms of sunlight and outlook, amongst other matters, as well as the London Plan Policy 7.6 that requires buildings not to cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. The development would also conflict with the Framework that seeks development to achieve well-designed places, with a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

15. The impact of the proposal in respect of trees on site have been brought to my attention, however the Council have raised no objections on this basis and I can see no reason to not concur with this.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and taking all matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR