



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3256155

76 Hoodcote Gardens, London N21 2NE

- 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 Jacques Toumany against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00583/HOU, dated 17 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2020.
 - The development proposed was described as 'demolition of garage and utility. Construction of 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension involving demolition of garage and alterations to front entrance, single storey rear extension together with extension to roof at side to form gable end with rear dormer and front rooflights at 76 Hoodcote Gardens, London N21 2NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00583/HOU, dated 17 February 2020 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 002-PL-01, 002-PL-02, 002-PL-03, 002-PL-04, 002-PL-05 Location Plan, 002-PL-05 Proposed Block Plan, 002-PL-06 Existing Sections and 002-PL-06 Proposed Sections.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The postcode for the appeal site was given as N21 2NG on the application form but N21 2NE on the appeal form. As it reflects the postcode on the Council's decision, I have used the latter in the banner heading and formal decision above.
3. The development description in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. Section E of the appeal form indicates however that a revised description was agreed with the Council, and describes the proposal as 'two storey side extension involving demolition of garage and alterations to front entrance, single storey rear extension together with extension to roof at side to form gable end with rear dormer and front rooflights'. As this accurately

describes the proposal, I have determined the appeal accordingly and used the revised description in my formal decision above.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and
- ii) the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 74 Hoodcote Gardens with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. Hoodcote Gardens is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings occupying plots of similar widths and depths and arranged on fairly strong building lines. The semi-detached pairs are for the most part of similar designs, typically including two-storey front bays beneath gable roofs and with common materials of brick and pale render. This adds a sense of coherence to the street scene, but assorted alterations are nevertheless apparent to many of the buildings and there is further diversity as a result of the detached dwellings which are of more varied sizes and designs.
6. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling with a single-storey garage to its side. The proposal includes a rear extension to the dwelling which would exceed the 3m depth specified within Policy DMD 11 of Enfield's Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) for single storey-rear extensions to semi-detached properties. Be that as it may, it would be no deeper than the adjacent projection to the rear of 78 Hoodcote Gardens, and a rear garden of substantial depth would be retained on the site. The extension would also have a flat roof form and a reduced floor level below the existing ground floor of the appeal dwelling, and would as a result be of fairly modest height against the host building.
7. Notwithstanding its depth, I therefore consider that the extension would not be unduly bulky nor disproportionate to the dwelling or site, and the design of the glazing and use of matching materials would further be sympathetic to the host dwelling. It would also not be out of keeping with the varied extensions to other buildings in the vicinity, and the scale and the position of the extension to the rear of the dwelling further mean that opportunities for public views of it from the surrounding area would be fairly limited.
8. The side extension would be more visible in the street scene, and I accept that the dwellings at 74 to 88 are of similar original appearance. Nevertheless, there are differences apparent, including a gable to the side of No 86 and two-storey side extensions to Nos 74, 80 and 82. No 74 also has a different roof form with a section of ridge which runs perpendicular to the front elevation. These variations mean that I did not find there to be a strong sense of uniformity across the group, and I noted further diversity in the wider street scene with a number of other side gables, dormers and extensions present to the mix of buildings, in many cases to only one dwelling of a semi-detached pair.

9. The Council has not raised objections to the width or depth of the side extension, and given the lack of consistency, I am satisfied that the gable roof design would not be incongruous or disrupt any distinctive uniformity so as to be a dominant or jarring feature in the street scene. Moreover, although the proposal would alter the balance of the semi-detached pair of Nos 74 and 76, they are already of different scale and appearance. In this context, the development would not cause an uncharacteristic loss of symmetry.
10. The proposed rear dormer would extend in part from the new roofslope to the side extension. Even so, the generous set in from the sides of the roof and the eaves as well as the set down from the ridge would reduce its bulk and visual impact, and its overall size would not be inconsistent with other dormers that I was able to observe to the rear of dwellings on Hoodcote Gardens. I find as a result that it would appear proportionate and sympathetic to the host roofslope and would not dominate the dwelling or surrounding area.
11. I acknowledge that the development as a whole would increase the size of the dwelling, and particularly its upper part, but the resulting scale of the building would not be significantly different to others within the vicinity so as to be prominent or obtrusive in the street scene. Moreover, the inclusion of a two-storey front bay feature would reflect the appearance of the existing dwelling as well as others nearby, while its height below the existing front bay to the dwelling would lend a degree of subservience to the extension. The external materials would also match the existing dwelling. Taking these factors together, I find that the development would integrate well with the street scene and surrounding group of buildings as a sympathetic addition to the dwelling.
12. For these reasons, I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of either the host dwelling or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010, Policies DMD 8, DMD 13, DMD 14 or DMD 37 of the DMD or Policies 7.4 or 7.6 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. Together, these policies broadly seek high quality design and development which is appropriate to its context and which reinforces local character and distinctiveness. For similar reasons, I find no conflict with requirements within the National Planning Policy Framework which seek well-designed places as a key element of sustainable development.

Living Conditions

13. From the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment that the side extension and roof alterations would be acceptable with regard to their effect on neighbouring living conditions, and that the occupiers of No 78 would not be adversely affected by the rear extension.
14. With a depth of around 6.3m, the extension would be more than double the 3m depth specified within DMD Policy DMD 11 and would project some way beyond the rear of the closest part of the attached dwelling at No 74. It would also cross a line taken at 45 degrees from the mid-point of the nearest ground floor windows to this neighbour, contrary to guidance at 2.b. of this policy.
15. However, the floor level within the extension would be below the existing ground floor of the appeal dwelling which is already appreciably lower than the ground floor to No 74. This would serve to reduce the height of the extension

as seen from the perspective of No 74, with the extension roof set some way beneath the top of the neighbouring glazing and projecting only a fairly small amount over the height of the section of the existing boundary wall closest to the rear of the buildings.

16. As a consequence, the visual impact of the extension as well as its effect on daylight to the rear windows and patio of No 74 would be relatively modest. Generous open outlook would also be retained across the deep gardens of No 74 and the appeal site beyond the extension so that the development would not give rise to an undue sense of enclosure. The position of No 74 broadly south of the appeal site would further ensure that there would be no significant overshadowing or loss of sunlight as a consequence of the extension. I am accordingly satisfied that the proposed rear extension would not be overbearing or cause significant loss of light or outlook to neighbouring occupiers.
17. Notwithstanding its depth, I therefore conclude on this main issue that the rear extension would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy DMD 8 of the DMD which includes a requirement for development to preserve amenity, nor with Policy DMD 11 which outlines that rear extensions will only be permitted if there is no impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

18. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. A condition to require the use of materials to match the existing building is also necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR