
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3300037

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 Mr David Barnard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/00056/HOU, dated 8 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a ground floor side/rear extension, first floor side extension, roof extension incorporating rear dormer/gable end and front velux.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appeal property was the subject of a grant of planning permission in November 2020 on appeal (Ref APP/Q5300/D/20/3254782) for a similarly described development. As was the case with the previous appeal, this proposal contains a number of elements. The Council has raised no concern with regard to the ground floor rear extension or to the rear dormer window. I have no reason to disagree. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposed first-floor side extension on the character and appearance of 11 Bourne Hill and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. I understand from the previous Inspector's decision, and from plans of the existing building submitted with the original planning application, that the dwelling originally had a linked garage to the side. At the time of my visit, I saw that the frame of a two-storey side extension had been constructed in place of the garage up to approximately eaves level height and extending up to the side boundary shared with No 9. No 9 is an end of terrace that sits slightly forward of the appeal property and is constructed up to the common side boundary at ground floor with the first-floor set away from the side boundary by approximately 1m and with a hipped roof over. The area in general contains a mix of detached, semi-detached, and terraced houses.

4. The proposal includes a two-storey side extension, built up to the boundary with No 9, as appears to be currently constructed, and with a gabled roof that would be set away from the boundary by 500mm. This would differ from the scheme that was approved on appeal which proposed the first-floor to be stepped away from the side boundary and with a hipped roof over. The Inspector in that case found that given the hipped roof profile proposed for 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. In addition, the Inspector found that despite the marked reduction of the gap at first-floor level, as large gaps between dwellings is not a defining feature in this part of the street, the reduced level of separation that was proposed would not look unusual in its context.
5. In this case, the gap at first-floor level between Nos 9 and 11 would be eroded further beyond that previously allowed, not only by encroachment of the side extension at first-floor level up to the boundary, but also by the additional bulk created at roof level by the hip to gable change. In my assessment this would tip the balance beyond an acceptable degree of separation between both properties. It would also result in an awkward and close relationship between the two contrasting roof profiles of Nos 9 and 11, and a poorly conceived and disjointed inset to the side gable at eaves level. When all of this is considered, I find that the proposal would appear incongruous and disruptive to the visual harmony of the street scene.
6. By creating a gabled roof, the proposal would also unbalance the character and symmetry of the original semi-detached pair at Nos 11 and 13. This would directly conflict with part 2 of Policy DMD 13 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD), adopted in 2014, which deals with roof extensions and which states, amongst other things, that extensions to the side of a property must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or pair of properties of which the dwelling forms a part.
7. My attention has been drawn to examples along Bourne Hill where similar dwellings have altered roof forms. The examples shown by photographs within the appellant's grounds of appeal at Nos 5, 26 and 32 Bourne Hill all have side dormer extensions that are not comparable to the appeal proposal. No 30 is a corner property and sits within an entirely different context to No 11. Nos 10, 12, and 28 all appeared to have had hip to gable changes. However, none appeared to include a sideways extension at first-floor level. Regardless, my overall impression was that those with gabled roofs were by far the minority in the locality and were not so prolific to have changed the overriding cohesive architectural character of this part of Bourne Hill. Moreover, I have been provided with no specific details of the planning history to these properties in terms of relevant policies that may have been in place when granting planning permission, or even if an application for planning permission would have been required.
8. I have noted the planning permission that was granted in 2007 for extending No 13 with a single-storey rear and two-storey side extension with a rear dormer window. This has not been implemented but regardless, the permission pre-dates adoption of the current development plan and, in any case, the permission included a hipped roof over the side extension, thereby maintaining some balance with No 11.

9. Overall, for the reasons given, I find that due to the width and appearance of the first-floor side extension, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of 11 Bourne Hill and the wider street scene. I have identified clear conflict with Policy DMD 13 of the currently adopted DMD. By failing to achieve a high-quality design and appropriate regard to its surroundings, the proposal would also conflict with DMD Policies DMD 6, DMD 8 and DMD 37, Core Policy 30 of the Council's Core Strategy 2010, and Policy D4 of The London Plan 2021. For the same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) objectives for achieving well-designed places.
10. Paragraph 2 of the Framework states that planning law requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The developments nearby and within the wider area that have been put to me have been noted but their circumstances do not lend sufficient weight in favour of the appeal proposal to outweigh the harm that I have identified and the conflicts with local and national policy. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR