



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3260321

23 Reservoir Road, Southgate N14 4BB

- 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 N Onay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/02361/HOU, dated 28 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is part single, part 2 storey rear extension, first floor side extension and alterations to ground floor front bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed rear extension on
 - (i) the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 21 Reservoir Road with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached property located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached properties of varied character set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway.
5. The proposal would entail the construction of a part single storey and part two storey rear extension with a flat roof that would extend across the full width of the property. The proposal would also involve a first floor side extension over the existing catslide roof and alterations to the existing front bay window.

6. Although the proposed extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size, the scale and form of the proposed rear extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. The proposed scale and form of the rear extension combined with the awkward design and bulkiness of the flat roof over the extension would be very much at odds with the modern hipped roof at the rear of the host property.
7. The consequential harm would not in my view be sufficiently resolved by the limited effect of the proposed extension on the street scene. In any case, the proposal would be visible over short distances along Stafford Close at the rear of the house and from the surrounding properties. I therefore consider that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed rear extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property.
8. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed rear extension have been carefully considered in order to minimise any impacts on the host property and the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to the overall aims of Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 and Policy DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrate a high quality design, that is appropriate to its context and the existing pattern of development and the local character.

Living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property

10. The proposed two storey rear extension would be located set back approximately 1m from the common shared side boundary with the adjacent detached property at No. 21 Reservoir Road (No. 21), to the south-east of the site. The adjacent property, at No. 21, has a single storey rear extension with a small patio area leading out to an enclosed garden area at the rear and some single storey buildings at the side. No. 21 is set further forward and separated from the appeal site by a pedestrian passageway, high close boarded fence and mature vegetation running between the properties.
11. Given the overall design and layout of the two storey rear extension together with the orientation and the separate distance between the buildings, I consider that the rear extension would not result in significant loss of available light to the main habitable rooms and garden at the rear of No. 21. However, this is not a determinative factor on its own.
12. Whilst the layout of the adjacent property and the boundary treatment would limit potential views directly from the rooms at the rear of the adjacent property at No. 21, the proposed extension would result in a long two storey projection running parallel with the common shared boundary and the small patio area and enclosed garden area at the rear of No. 21. The occupants of

No. 21 would use this area to carry out leisure and household activities when relaxing and sitting out, particularly during the summer months.

13. Given the overall scale and siting of the proposed extension and the separation distance between the properties, I consider that the proposed two storey extension would introduce a dominant and enclosing structure in close proximity to the common shared boundary and the small patio area and garden area at the rear of No. 21. This, in my view, would significantly dominate the views to cause an overbearing effect and an unacceptable loss of outlook for the occupiers of No. 21. I therefore consider that the proposal would result in a poor quality living environment and an unacceptable change in the living conditions for the occupiers of the neighbouring property.
14. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed two storey rear extension would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 21 Reservoir Road with particular regard to outlook. It would be contrary to Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 and Policies DMD8 and DMD11 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development and extensions do not impact on the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring properties and protects the residential amenity of the neighbouring residents in terms of outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Other Matters

15. I have noted the appellant's comments that a rear extension could be constructed on the site under General Permitted Development in this instance. Whilst this maybe so, this does not set a precedent for such an inappropriate development in this location for the reasons set out above. In the absence of any detailed plans to show what this development would entail and information to demonstrate the likelihood of its implementation, I accord these matters limited weight in making this decision.
16. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design and providing additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant's family. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR