
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3258869

48 Fairgreen, Enfield EN4 0QS

- 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 U Bhatti against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01750/HOU, dated 10 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension to pool house and new games room over, Part first floor extension to house and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with accommodation in the roof, a single storey side addition which integrates with a garage and a large single storey rear addition that includes a swimming pool. The bungalow's and garage's roofs are a hipped form, the side addition has a flat roof and the swimming pool a crown style roof. By reason of the differences in ground level, the height of the single storey addition, allows views from the road towards the woodland at the rear of the property.
4. The property is situated within a primarily residential area comprised predominantly of 2-storey dwellings. These dwellings are located on large plots with landscaped gardens and, when taken together with the views available between properties or above single storey additions, the surrounding area has a spacious and verdant appearance.
5. Planning permission was granted in 2015 by the Council for an extension of the property to erect a first floor (Ref 15/03240/HOU). The resulting property would have reflected the design and form of the bungalow with the retention of the front projecting gables and the hipped roof. This permission has lapsed.
6. The proposed development includes alterations to the property comprising an extension of the main roof across the single storey side addition. This would possess a gabled rather than hipped roof form. Two additional front dormers

with hipped roofs would be erected. The garage's hipped roof would be partially subsumed into the gable roof extension. Policy DMD 13 of Enfield's Development Management Document (DMP) refers to assessing a roof extension in relation to a proposal not disrupting the character or balance of the property.

7. The appeal scheme also includes the proposed extension of the swimming pool together with the erection of a first floor which would retain a crown style roof on 3 sides albeit with an increase in the height of the sloping roof elements. Within the roofslope facing towards the garden there would be a number of flat roof dormers. By reason of siting and separation distances, the increase in the size and height of the swimming pool addition would not be a visually prominent form of development from the rear windows and gardens of neighbouring properties.
8. The appellant claims that the roofs above the single storey addition and swimming pool would be discrete elements. However, the drawings indicate these roofs would meet at the gable end of the proposed swimming pool's roof. The impression from the drawings and what was observed during the site visit is that these proposed roofs would join together to create the appearance of a large single roof spread across the bungalow, side addition and swimming pool.
9. From the road, I share the Council's concerns that the proposed development would result in a bulky and visually obtrusive form of development which would not promote a high quality of design. There would be an unbalancing of the bungalow's existing hipped roof form and an awkward juxtaposition between the extended roof, the proposed swimming pool's roof and the residual flat roof areas of the garage.
10. The combination of the design, form and massing of the proposed roofs would result in a bulky and visually dominant addition to the enlarged property when viewed from the road. The scale and bulk of the enlarged property would appear to occupy the full width of the plot. Further, the height of the proposed roof extension would reduce the ability to see the woodland at the rear of the property. All these matters would be detrimental to the contribution currently made by the property to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with DMP Policies DMD 11, DMD 13, DMD 14 and DMD 37, Policy 30 of Enfield's Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. Amongst other matters and in addition to the assessment of roof extensions, these policies are concerned with roof extensions improving the built environment, including by reference to taking into account the nature of the surrounding area and promoting high quality development of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR