



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2022

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/21/3288390

Flat 2, 387A Bowes Road, Southgate, London N11 1AB

- 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 Andreas Kontoyiannis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/03334/FUL, dated 29 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2021.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'new access and erection of a single storey rear extension to Flat 2, 387B Bowes Road'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, the appeal form gives an amended description of 'new access and erection of a single storey rear extension to Flat 2, 387A Bowes Road'. This description is consistent with the site address used by both the appellant and the Council, and I have considered the appeal on the basis of this description.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and area; and (ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 385 and 389 Bowes Road with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal proposes an extension to a ground-floor flat within a two-storey end-of-terrace building. Most of the buildings within the terrace have similar architectural detailing, external materials and fenestration patterns, and there is a regular arrangement of two-storey front bays and rear outrigger projections. While there are existing rear extensions to some of the buildings, including on the appeal site, these are generally single-storey and of modest depth beyond the outriggers, and there remains a rhythm and strong sense of uniformity to the group overall.
5. Policy DMD 11 of the Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) indicates that single storey extensions to terraced properties should not exceed

3m in depth beyond the original rear wall. The appellant does not dispute that the proposed development would project up to around 14m from the main rear wall of the appeal building. I acknowledge that the increase in depth over the existing extension on the site would be fairly modest at around 3m and that there is a two-storey outrigger to the appeal building which the appellant advises is around 7.1m deep. Even so, the proposal would still result in development of more than double the depth that Policy DMD 11 suggests may be acceptable when measured from the outrigger.

6. Notwithstanding the relatively long rear garden that would be retained, I consider that the total depth of single-storey development would be excessive against the host building. The development would be set in from the boundaries of the site, but would still span a significant proportion of the width of the host building, and the chamfered edges to the rear of the extension would do little to alleviate its large overall mass and scale. In my assessment, the proposal would therefore result in a bulky and awkward addition that would unacceptably diminish the character, appearance and integrity of the host building.
7. Moreover, the development would extend well beyond the two-storey projections to nearby buildings, and would also be notably deeper than the single-storey extensions that I observed to other buildings on this part of Bowes Road. Its projection much further to the rear than the neighbouring buildings would be striking, and would exacerbate the unsympathetic and incongruous nature of the development.
8. The extension would be largely screened to views from the Bowes Road streetscene. Nevertheless, it would be apparent from neighbouring properties and gardens where I find that the depth and bulk of the development would be unduly prominent and visually jarring, detracting from the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
9. I note that the proposal includes an increase in glazing in comparison to the existing single-storey extension. However, I am not persuaded that this would represent a significant visual improvement so as to offset or compensate for the harms that I have identified above.
10. Irrespective of the use of matching materials, I conclude for these reasons that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area. It would therefore conflict with Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 (LP), Core Policy 30 of the Core Strategy 2010 (CS) and Policies DMD 6, DMD 8, DMD 11 and DMD 37 of the DMD insofar as they broadly seek good design, development that is sympathetic to local distinctiveness and context and that is of appropriate scale, bulk and massing. For the same reasons, I find that the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of the LP which is referred to by the appellant and which includes requirements for development to enhance local context, respond positively to local distinctiveness and to the character of a place.

Living Conditions

11. Although the extension would further increase the depth of development on the site, it would be set in from the boundaries with the neighbouring buildings at 385 and 389 Bowes Road. In my judgement, this relationship means that the additional depth of development would not be likely to result in any significant

increase in the impression of enclosure or shadowing, or in a reduction in light to windows to the main rear elevation of these neighbours in comparison to the existing situation.

12. The extension would not intrude on a 45-degree line taken from the mid point of ground floor windows to the rear of the deeper parts of the neighbouring buildings, in accordance with requirements at Policy DMD 11 of the DMD. Both neighbours would retain open aspect to their rear along gardens of generous depth, and I am satisfied having regard to the relatively modest height of the development that the separation to the site boundaries would be sufficient to ensure that the proposal would not lead to a significant increase in enclosure or in a loss of outlook for the neighbouring windows or gardens. I am similarly satisfied that these factors would ensure no harmful loss of light or overshadowing.
13. I therefore conclude that the development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 385 or 389 Bowes Road. In this regard, I find no conflict with Policies DMD 8, DMD 11 or DMD 37 of the DMD insofar as they include requirements that development preserves amenity in terms of daylight, sunlight and outlook and has appropriate regard to its surroundings.

Other Matters

14. I am sympathetic to the appellant's desire to provide additional and enhanced accommodation that could improve living conditions for future occupiers of the flat. However, no substantive evidence has been provided of any significant current detriment to living conditions of occupiers, and I do not find that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm that I have identified would be caused to the character and appearance of the host building and area, and the consequent conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR