

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2016

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 22 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3156368
19 Northumberland Avenue, Enfield EN1 4HF

- 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 Darius Prieskienis against the decision of the Council for the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 15/05806/HOU, dated 13 December 2015 , was refused by notice dated 1 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a minor amendments to the approved interior layouts of the existing and proposed dwellings at ground level plus minor amendments to the approved layout at the rear of the existing dwelling at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey house situated on a residential estate. The local area is characterised by generally similar style two-storey, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, giving the area a planned character and appearance. The house has had alterations made to it in the past and construction of a new, attached, two-storey dwelling to the side of the house and a single-storey rear extension to the main house are currently under way.
 4. The appeal proposal includes first floor extension of the original dwelling which would have two main elements. The first main element would be a rear projection which would span something less than half the width of the rear elevation of the original dwelling. The back wall of the projection would be stepped back from the back of the new dwelling adjoining and it would have a hipped roof which would reflect the design of the host property and the new dwelling which is under construction. Overall, the design of the rear projection would be in keeping with the host property and it would appear subservient to the appeal building as a whole. It would, therefore, meet the aims of good design sought by Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (CS),
-

Policies DMD8 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (ECDMD) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (LP).

5. The second main element of the proposed development would be a flat-roofed extension which would project about 0.6 metres from the rear elevation of the main house at first floor level. The flat roof would be set at the eaves height of the host property and would not reflect the design of the host building or the new dwelling. Further, its rear projection would result in an abrupt and incongruous link with the rear elevation of adjoining property. Overall the flat-roofed extension would have a box-like appearance would stand out as an incongruous feature which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rear elevation of the host property which would in turn adversely affect the character and appearance of the local area. In these respects the proposed development would fail to meet the aims of good design sought by CS Core Policy 30, ECDMD Policies DMD8 and DMD 37 and LP Policies 7.4 and 7.6.
6. Whilst the rear of the property is not visible from the public domain on Northumberland Avenue, it is open to view from the backs of the nearby dwellings to the rear of the appeal property. Consequently, the adverse effect of the proposed flat-roofed extension on the character and appearance of the appeal property would be experienced by occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

7. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and housing applications should be considered in the context of this presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Whilst the proposed extensions would provide useful additional living space for the appellant and the hipped-roofed rear projection would be in keeping with the host property, the flat-roofed part of the development would result in the appeal property detracting from the character and appearance of the local area. Therefore, on balance, I conclude that the proposed extensions would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework.
8. I have considered whether it would be possible to issue a split decision. However, from the evidence presented, it is not clear that it would be practical to build the rear projection as designed and not the flat roofed extension. Therefore, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR