
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2016

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3154741
64 Turkey Street, Enfield, EN3 5TW

- 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 P Gomes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 15/05424/HOU, dated 29 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2016.
 - The development is described as "Re-submission two storey side and part single storey rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of its host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. Located on Turkey Street, in a mainly residential area, the appeal property is semi-detached, hipped-roofed, and set back from the highway behind a front garden now used for parking. The pairs of semi-detached dwellings on the even side of Turkey Street have a strongly symmetrical arrangement created by the paired gables, bay windows, arched doorways, and emphasised by their central chimney stacks. Spacing between the properties, particularly at upper levels is reasonably generous. At the rear, the appeal property has been extended considerably, with a large single-storey flat-roofed element across the full width of the rear elevation, and an element, described in the appeal statement as a conservatory, attached to the back of that.
 4. The appeal proposal consists of a side extension that at ground floor level would run more or less along the common boundary with No 62, but at first floor it would be narrower, and consequently about 0.5m from the boundary with No 62. At first floor, the extension would wrap around the rear elevation of its host dwelling, extending beyond it by around 1m and having a width of around 4m, and thus separated from the boundary with No 66 by around 3.5m. The side element of the extension would replicate the height and angles of the host dwelling's existing roof, and the rear element would also be hipped roofed, but set down from the main roof ridge.
-

5. Whilst the proposed development would constitute a reduction in scale and massing from a previously refused scheme at the site, it would still, due to its extremely close siting to No 62 be strongly at variance with the prevailing rhythm and development pattern of the streetscene. What is more, the gap achieved from the boundary with No 62 would conflict with Policy DMD14 of *Enfield's Development Management Document* (adopted November 2014) ('the DMD'), which states, in relation to side extensions that a minimum distance of 1m from the boundary of adjoining properties should be maintained, in order to avoid a 'terracing effect'.
6. At my site visit I saw that, in the main where side extensions are present they are predominantly of one-storey, subservient to their host dwellings and maintain the sense of spaciousness at upper levels. In contrast, due to its scale, massing and tight relationship with its neighbouring property, the proposed development would impart a cramped congestion to the plot.
7. The proposed development would replicate the scale and massing of its host dwelling, and would not be stepped back from its principal building line. It would thus read as a dominant addition, and furthermore, create a visually jarring imbalance in terms of the strongly symmetrical facades and roofscape of the host building. Thus the appeal scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene and the host building in these regards.
8. The changes visible at the rears of other properties in the vicinity of the appeal building mean that, to some extent, this elevation is less sensitive to change than its frontage. However, the rear projection of the proposed extension, in would dwarf the existing bay window at first floor. It would thus read as a dominant addition, which would exacerbate the overall sense of imbalance created by the scheme. This aspect of the proposed development could be seen in views from Winnington Road, and would interrupt the symmetry and rhythm of the paired bay windows on these rear elevations, which would add to its visually harmful effects.
9. My attention has been drawn to two similar two-storey extensions in the area. I have been supplied with the planning history of one and note that in that case planning permission was granted before the adoption of the DMD. I saw at my site visit that this example serves to illustrate the terracing effect which Policy DMD 14 seeks to ensure that new developments avoid. The other is on a corner plot, and consequently achieves considerably more side space between the extension and its adjacent property than the proposed development would do. In any event, each proposal has to be assessed on its own planning merits.
10. I am aware that there are terraced properties on the even-numbered side of Turkey Street, however, they are obviously of a different character to the appeal property and its semi-detached neighbours, and separated by Winnington Road. Thus I consider that their presence does not contribute considerably to the context of the appeal site, or serve to justify the proposed development to any significant degree. I note that the appeal property is outside of land with any special planning designations and the property itself is not listed. I also acknowledge that the proposed development could avoid harm to the living conditions of the occupants of adjacent properties. However, these are matters which would not outweigh the significant harms to

the character and appearance of the area and the host building that the proposed development would cause. Furthermore, I consider that it has not been conclusively demonstrated that the necessity to modernise and regenerate the appeal property outweighs the harms that I have identified.

11. My attention has been drawn to the presumption in favour of sustainable development established by the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). For the purposes of the Framework, sustainable development has three aspects: the social; the economic; and the environmental. In the current case the proposal could improve the living conditions of the occupants of the appeal property. However, whilst this may be the case, the modest number of people that this is likely to affect would mean it would be a benefit that only attracts limited weight in the overall planning balance in terms of the social aspects of sustainable development.
12. Turning to the economic aspect, benefits would accrue in the construction phase of the proposed development through employment and the supply of materials. However, due to the modest scale of the proposal, and the temporary nature of these effects, these benefits would not weigh heavily in favour of the scheme.
13. In terms of the environmental dimension, the appeal scheme could lead to a more efficient use of the site. However, the very limited environmental benefit of this aspect of the proposed development would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by its environmental harms to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene. Consequently, the environmental aspect of sustainable development would not be met by the scheme. Furthermore, as the harm I have identified in these regards would outweigh the somewhat modest economic and social benefits of the proposed development it would not therefore constitute sustainable development for the purposes of the Framework.
14. Accordingly, I conclude that due to the considerable harm that the proposed development would cause both to the host building and its surroundings it would conflict with Policy CP30 of *The Enfield Plan: Core Strategy* (adopted November 2010); Policies DMD8, DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the DMD; and Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of *The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London-Consolidated with alterations since 2011*. Taken together, and amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that new development is sensitive to the character and appearance of its surroundings.
15. No material considerations have been demonstrated that would outweigh these conflicts with the development plan. Consequently, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR