

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Andrew McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3156812

5 Ripon Road, Edmonton, Enfield N9 7RE

- 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 Mehmet Elitok against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/00875/HOU, dated 29 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is part single, part 2-storey rear extension and first floor rear extension gable end and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is on the north side of Ripon Road and is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which forms a pair with its adjoining dwelling to the west at 7 Ripon Road (No 7). The area has a mix of uses and buildings including single-storey detached and two-storey semi-detached residential properties on the north side of Ripon Road, a primary school on the south side of road and some flatted development to the east and west. The streetscene on the north side of Ripon Road predominantly consists of distinct pairs of semi-detached two-storey properties and detached single-storey properties. These are clearly defined by the visual gaps which appear between them. The neighbouring semi-detached property at 3 Ripon Road (No 3) has a two-storey side extension which extends up to the boundary with the appeal site and effectively adjoins the existing single-storey garage on it.
 4. The proposed development would include a large two-storey side extension which would result in a loss of separation between the host property and No 3. Furthermore, due to its closeness to the built form of No 3, the proposed development would create a terracing effect in the streetscene. The proposed side extension, due to its siting, design and roof form would result in a continuous frontage of development consisting of the properties at Nos 1, 3, 5 and 7 Ripon Road.
-

5. I note that the side extensions to No 1 and No 3 Ripon Road have been built up to the boundaries of their neighbouring properties. In the case of the extension to No 1, there is little adverse effect on the streetscene as a substantial separation distance is retained between that property and those properties on Doncaster Road due to their rear gardens. Furthermore, the side extensions have been set back in order to lessen their impact. Whilst a set back at first floor level is proposed as part of the appeal scheme, this would have little effect in mitigating the terracing effect due to the scale of the proposed extension and its proximity to No 3. With regard to other extensions being comparable to the proposal, the side extensions to No 1, No 3 and No 7 Ripon Road are not of the size, scale and mass of that which is proposed.
6. The appellant accepts that the proposal would create a quasi-terracing effect but also states that each application must be assessed on its own merits. In this case, the appellant argues that the proposal would result in the closing of a small gap at first floor level between No 3 and No 5 with the existing garage at No 5 being at ground floor level. However, I find that the proposal would completely close the remaining visible gap between the appeal property and No 3 which is partially retained by the garage at the appeal property.
7. The Council argues that the scheme would unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties which include the host property and No 7. However, these properties are not symmetrical in appearance. Notwithstanding this, it is the proportions of the two properties in terms of their width, scale and massing within the pair which would be unbalanced by the proposed development.
8. The appellant states that there is a varied streetscene within which the proposal would be set which includes, amongst other matters, a different roof form at No 3. Furthermore, the appellant argues that other properties in the locality have been extended in a comparable manner to that of the proposed development and that simply by a building being larger, it does not mean that it would necessarily lead to harm. However in this case, from what I have seen and read, I conclude that the sizeable proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property in terms of its scale and massing and that of the streetscene with regard to its siting, form and design.
9. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be within an accessible location and would have some social and economic benefits in terms of providing additional accommodation which is sought in this area. However, these would not, either individually or cumulatively, outweigh the significant harm which I have identified.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy and Policies DMD11, DMD13 and DMD14 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014. Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that development has regard to its context and local distinctiveness and, in the case of extensions, that it has no detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host property or that of the surrounding area.

Other Consideration

Permitted development and fall-back

11. The appellant has indicated that under the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO), the appeal property could be extended to a similar degree to that proposed. Such a position is a legitimate and material consideration although the amount of weight to be afforded to it is conditioned by how realistic the permitted development (PD) scheme is, and the likelihood of it being implemented. The appellant states that if the appeal failed then they would have no choice but to fall back upon a PD extension. Whilst the appellant argues that such a side extension development could be up to a height of 4 metres, Paragraph Class A.1(i) of the GPDO states that development will not be permitted where the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would be within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, and the height of the eaves of the enlarged part would exceed three metres.
12. As a result, I have doubts as to the likelihood of a similar scale, height and extent of development being progressed under PD. Therefore, I find it unlikely that a PD scheme would have a greater detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area than the proposed development before me. Consequently, I attach limited weight to the fallback position.

Conclusion

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

Andrew McCormack

INSPECTOR