



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by S R G Baird BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3250342

Alexandra Court, Southgate, London N14 4RE

- 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 Robert Young against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00733/FUL, dated 14 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a three-storey extension to existing flats comprising 3 x studio flats with associated landscaping works.
-

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. These are the effects on the character and appearance of the host building and area, and on neighbours' living conditions with regard to visual impact and daylight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a three-storey apartment block set on the edge of a cluster of similar buildings. It is set back from Chase Road to the front and houses on Tregenna Close to the side by the communal lawn.
5. Despite the density of housing in the area, there is a general open character created by the tree lined streets and generous setbacks of buildings from the road and from one another. While the front building line, eaves and ridges of the proposed extension would align with those of the host building, the 3-storey extension would be a large and prominent addition and erode part of this open character by infilling the existing gap between Alexandra Court and houses at Tregenna Close. Despite the use of matching materials, the extension would add significant bulk to this side of the structure and appear contrived and cramped in its location. This harm would be compounded by the use of smaller fenestration and balconies and adding a door to the front elevation.

6. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area. As such it would be contrary to Policies DMD6, DMD7, DMD8, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (CS) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (LP). Collectively these seek to ensure the scale and form of development is appropriate to the existing pattern of development or setting, having regard to the character typologies.

Living conditions of occupiers of dwellings on Tregenna Close

7. The side wall of the proposed extension would project to within 2.5m of the rear boundary of several dwellings on Tregenna Close. At 3-storey, this elevation would appear dominant in views from the rear gardens of these properties. This visual impact would be exacerbated by the blank expanse of brick on this side elevation. As a result, the proposal would create an increased sense of enclosure and have an unacceptably overbearing impact.
8. Submitted photographs show gaps between the trees lining this boundary. As such, these trees would not block views of the extension. Moreover, they could be removed at any time. The lack of a set separation distance between extensions and existing properties in the LP does not make the proposal acceptable in this regard.
9. The rear gardens of these properties on Tregenna Close are north facing. As such they will already experience a reduced amount of daylight, which is further reduced by the trees. The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Analysis concludes there would be a negligible impact on daylight as a result of the proposed extension. From all I have seen and read I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion.
10. Notwithstanding the lack of harm due to reduced daylight, the proposal would cause material harm to the living conditions of occupiers of dwellings by creating an overbearing impact on outlook. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies DMD7, DMD8 and DMD10 of the DMD and CP30 of the CS. These seek to ensure development will preserve amenity in terms of daylight and outlook, among others.

Other matters

11. I acknowledge there would be some benefits to the proposal, such as 3 additional units of housing and providing a mix of accommodation types. However, compliance with other policies, such as 3.4 of the LP, does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
12. I note the Council's approval of a similar development at Catherine Court. However, this predates the CS, DMD and the National Planning Policy Framework. It is also two-storey rather than three. As such it is not directly comparable to the proposal before me. Regardless, each proposal is assessed on its own merits and the Catherine Court decision would have had its own set of circumstances which led to its approval. As such it does not alter my findings in this case.

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.

George Baird

INSPECTOR