



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 October 2020 by S Witherley

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3254782

11 Bourne Hill, LONDON, N13 4LJ

- 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 Tanamal of Goldeneye Estates against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00392/HOU, dated 4 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is *demolition of garage, single storey side /rear extension, first floor side extension/side roof extension, rear dormer and side roof velux.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the single storey rear extension, 1st floor side extension involving conversion of garage into habitable room together with rear dormer with front and side roof lights, at 11 Bourne Hill, LONDON, N13 4LJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00392/HOU, dated 4 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: Location plan, proposed plans and elevations Drawing No. 2.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

1. 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The description used in the decision above was changed from that submitted and agreed by both parties.

Main Issue

3. The proposal contains a number of elements. It is common ground between parties that the proposed conversion of the garage into a habitable room together with the rear dormer with front and side roof lights and the impact on

neighbouring living conditions have been assessed and found to comply with the relevant planning policies. These matters are not subject to disagreement and there are no reasons to consider otherwise.

4. Therefore, the main issue of this appeal relates to the first-floor side extension and the effect of this on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. No. 11 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey linked garage. It sits within a section of street which contains a mix of house types including detached, semi-detached and a short-terraced row. The short terrace sits adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 11. Unlike other properties within the street, which follow a similar building line, the terrace block sits slightly forward within the streetscape.
6. No. 11 along with its adjoining neighbour have a single storey linked garage. This affords an open aspect and a degree of separation between the respective neighbouring properties at first floor level. However, as most of the remaining properties in this section of street sit close to their shared boundary, with only a small gap between properties, the gap at first floor is not a repeating feature throughout this section of street and does not present visually as being a defining characteristic. Despite the variation in terms of property siting, size, type, and design, there is consistency in terms of the hipped roof profiles and use of similar materials.
7. The original roof of No. 11 is set down from its paired neighbour. This along with the forward position of the neighbouring terrace block, would ensure that the proposed hipped roof profile, which would align with the original, would not appear as an overly dominant or bulky addition when viewed from the public realm. Moreover, as a result of the forward position of the terrace row and the massing of its hipped roof together with its built form, the potential for the proposal to cause a terracing effect would be unlikely.
8. The proposed first floor side element would sit flush with the front elevation albeit it would be set back behind a mono pitched canopy at ground floor. This would break up the visual mass of the structure at first floor.
9. Policy DMD 14 of the Development Management Document (2014) (DMD) requires proposals to be set in from the shared boundary by 1 metre. The proposed set in appears to be less than this. Nevertheless, given the proposed hipped roof profile of No. 11 and the existing hipped roof of No. 9, the properties would continue to appear as separate from one another and each would retain its individual identity. Additionally, whilst the proposal would result in the marked reduction of the gap at first floor level, large gaps between dwellings is not a defining feature in this part of the street and the reduced level of separation would not look unusual in that context. Therefore, I do not consider its loss as having a harmful impact on the prevailing character of this part of Bourne Hill.
10. Drawing all of the above together, as the proposal would retain a visual separation from the neighbouring property, No. 9, and the original hipped roof form of the host building would be retained, the character and appearance of this section of Bourne Hill would be maintained, notwithstanding the conflict with part of the criteria of policy DMD 14 of the DMD.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposed first floor side extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with policy CP30 of the Core Strategy 2010 – 2025, Policies DMD 6, DMD 8, and DMD 37 and the main aims of Policy DMD 14 of the DMD, Policies 7.4 & 7.6 of The London Plan which together seek new development to be of a high standard which reflects and protects the areas locally distinct characteristics. Having regard to the compliance with those policies, taken as a whole, I am satisfied that the proposal complies with the overall aims of the development plan with regard to design such that the development should be permitted, notwithstanding the infringement of the 1m set in rule required by Policy DMD 14.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for the materials to match those that are used in the existing property to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

S Witherley

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, agree that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR