
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3251615
107 Palmerston Road, Southgate N22 8QX

- 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 Liam Hughes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00072/FUL, dated 4 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear and side single-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the interests of certainty, I have used the description of development from the application form omitting any wording that is not an act of development.
3. The Council included only one reason for refusal but with a couple main issues and policies therein, I have therefore considered each of the main issues with reference to only those policies that are directly relevant in each case.

Main Issues

4. While I note the single reason for refusal, from the wider evidence the main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised by two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings with narrow but long rear gardens such that the area has an attractive and spacious character and appearance. The host building is a mid-terraced two-storey property with basement space and a rear dormer. A number of the surrounding dwellings along the same side as the host building have modest single storey rear extensions such that this feature is a part of the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal consists of a single storey rear extension that would project a significant distance beyond the rear two storey original outrigger of the host building. While I note the proposed materials and that the proposal would be single storey, given the depth of the proposed extension, it would appear excessively large compared with the host building when viewed against the property as a whole. As such, it would harm the character of the host building.
7. From the evidence before me, and my observations during the site visit, the proposal would be roughly a similar depth to that of a few properties further along the terrace from the host building. However, the wider terrace is generally characterised by either no rear extensions or rear extensions of a modest depth. Therefore, particularly given that the buildings immediately adjacent to the host property do not have rear extensions, the proposed scheme would appear incongruous. I acknowledge the overall depth of the rear garden of the host property and that the proposal would not be visible from the street. However, given the excessive depth of the proposed extension that would be visible from the rear of the neighbouring dwellings, it would harmfully deviate from the prevailing pattern of development and have an adverse effect on the spacious character and appearance of the area.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 Adopted November 2010 (CS) which requires developments to have special regard to their context. It would also conflict with Policies DMD 8 and DMD 37 of the Development Management Document Adopted November 2014 (DMD) which seeks among other things, that new residential development be of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing and resists development that is inappropriate to its context. It would also conflict with DMD Policy DMD11 which requires that, among other things, there is no adverse visual impact and single storey extensions must not exceed 3 metres in depth beyond the original rear wall in the case of terraced and semi-detached properties. In addition, the proposal would conflict with Policy 7.4 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy For London Consolidated With Alterations Since 2011 March 2016 (LP) which relates to local character and with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) in this regard.

Living conditions

9. The proposed extension would project a significant distance into the rear garden. The adjacent dwellings to both sides do not appear to have rear extensions. The rear of the adjacent dwelling at No 109 Palmerston Road (No 109) is bound on one side by an extension that projects some distance above the shared boundary. The proposal would introduce a rear extension to the other side of No 109 that would also project above the rear boundary with considerable depth. Therefore, given the depth and height of the proposed extension, it would create a sense of enclosure that would diminish the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers.
10. I acknowledge the depth of the existing gardens, however, since the patio and seating area of No 109 is closer to the building, and neighbouring occupiers are more likely to spend time at this end of the garden, the proposal would unduly affect the living conditions of the occupiers in terms of outlook.

11. The proposal would also project a significant distance above the shared boundary with No 105 Palmerston Road. Since the rear of that property is not bound on its other side by any significant built development, while the proposal, given its depth, would appear dominant from that garden, the effect would not be as harmful to the neighbouring occupiers compared with No 109.
12. While I acknowledge concerns regarding the light to the neighbouring dwellings, both adjacent rear gardens would continue to receive adequate light from other directions and there would not be any undue adverse effects in this respect.
13. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with DMD Policies DMD 8 and 11 which only permits development if, among other things, it would preserve amenity in terms of outlook and there is no impact on the amenities of its neighbouring properties. It would also conflict with the Framework in this respect.

Other Matter

14. I note the evidence regarding the proposal improving the quality of internal residential space afforded to the host dwelling. However, given the harm identified above, this has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR