



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/3250447

192 Winchester Road, Edmonton, London N9 9EF

- 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 Isaac Marlon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/04316/HOU, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area, and on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.194 Winchester Road, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance of host dwelling and local area

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling. The rear of the property includes a part single-storey, part two-storey rear outrigger extension with a mono pitched roof. The proposal seeks to extend the first floor of the outrigger over the ground floor to create a flush, two-storey rear extension.
5. The first-floor extension would add substantial mass and bulk to the rear of the dwelling. While the eaves and apex would mirror that of the host building, it would not be a subordinate addition to the existing outrigger. Due to the modest rear garden, this would dominate the rear elevation and thereby cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building, despite the use of matching materials.
6. A notable characteristic of houses within this long terrace is their general uniformity to the rear. While some have been modified to a small degree, including single-storey infill extensions to the side returns such as No.194, generally speaking they have maintained the split-level arrangement typified by the appeal property. The proposal would break the common alignment of rear extensions in the terrace, harming the character and appearance of the area as a result.

7. While it may be the case that the proposal before me is more sympathetic to the host building and local area than the extension to the rear of No.190, evidently there is no record of a planning application being approved for this structure. Regardless of its status, it is the only extension of its type and breaks the existing common alignment to the rear of the terrace. As such, it would not necessarily be a good example of design to follow and assessing the proposal against the structure at No.190 does not make it acceptable. The location outside of a Conservation Area does not alter this assessment.
8. To conclude on this first main issue, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and local area. As such, it is contrary to Policies DMD11 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD), CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (CS) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (LP). Collectively, these seek to avoid extensions that cause adverse visual impact and state first floor rear extensions must, where appropriate, secure a common alignment of rear extensions. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks development which will function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Living conditions of occupiers of No.194

9. The rear elevation of No.194 includes a window serving a bedroom at first floor level. Due to the presence of outriggers flanking both dwellings, which are within the 30-degree arc of view from this window, I would agree there is already an element of enclosure. However, due to its depth the first-floor extension would appear significantly more overbearing than the existing first floor structure, which is modest in its projection. This would substantially increase the sense of enclosure and reduce outlook from this bedroom window, harming the living conditions of its occupiers.
10. I note the additional concern of the Council with regard to loss of daylight to this window and to the garden area of No.194. Given its position to the rear elevation flanked by existing outriggers, the first-floor window already experiences a reduced amount of daylight. Notwithstanding the increased depth of the extension to the appeal property, there would be no additional loss of daylight. Similarly, due to the narrow profiles and high fences of the gardens of No.194 and the appeal site, and the location of the garden area of No.194 at the end of its outrigger, it is unlikely the position of the first floor rear extension would cause a loss of daylight to the garden area of No.194.
11. Notwithstanding the above, to conclude on this second main issue the proposal would harm living conditions of No.194 with regard to visual impact and increasing the sense of enclosure. As such, it would be contrary to Policy DMD11 and DMD37 of the DMD, CP30 of the CS and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the LP. Collectively, these seek to ensure there is no impact on the amenities of the original building and its neighbouring properties. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework, which seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other matters

12. I note that no objections were received during the planning process. However, this is a neutral matter rather than one which weighs in favour of the scheme.

Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR