
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by A Napier BA(Hons) MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

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

Decision date: 30 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3157838
180 Southbury Road, Enfield EN1 1YG

- 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 Ali Ibrahim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/01034/HOU, dated 7 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension, roof extension with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension, roof extension with rear dormer at 180 Southbury Road, Enfield EN1 1YG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01034/HOU, dated 7 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SR/180/101.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling fronts the busy Southbury Road. Whilst commercial development exists nearby, the immediate vicinity of the appeal site is largely residential in character and the appeal property is one of a number of similar houses in this location. These dwellings have a high degree of consistency in their scale and incorporate a number of similar features, such as bay windows and a common palette of materials. However, although many nearby houses are semi-detached, terraces also exist and design details vary between dwellings, with many appearing to have been altered or extended over time.
 4. The appeal property is a two-storey end terrace house, in a short terrace of three dwellings. Both the appeal dwelling and the other end dwelling in the
-

terrace currently have hipped roofs. The details provided indicate that the appeal dwelling has been previously extended to the side and rear and No 178, the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling, also includes a single-storey element to the side, which is similar in appearance and scale to that of the appeal dwelling. As a result, a sizeable gap currently exists at first floor level between these two dwellings, which is enhanced by the hipped roofs of both these properties.

5. The proposed first floor side extension and hip-to-gable extension of the roof would materially alter the appearance of the appeal dwelling and reduce the size of this gap, which would also affect its relationship with the neighbouring property and the remainder of the terrace. However, although the roof is read as a whole within the streetscene, due to the limited size of the terrace and its siting relative to the highway, the roof is not a particularly prominent feature and is predominantly seen obliquely, which would significantly limit the visual impact of these proposed alterations.
6. In addition, although smaller than existing, a notable visual and physical separation would remain between No's 178 and 180 at first floor level and the proposal would retain the bay windows to the front elevation of the dwelling, which are important features that make a positive contribution to its appearance and that of the terrace as a whole. Furthermore, whilst there is some degree of consistency in design of the houses in this part of the street, they are not currently uniform in their appearance, with irregular spacing between them and a variety of different roof designs, including the gable roof to No 176 and the two-storey flat roof side extension to No 174.
7. The Council acknowledges the existing mix of roof designs within the area, but indicates that a number of the existing hip-to-gable extensions were carried out as 'permitted development'. However, whilst I do not have full details of those schemes and have considered the appeal proposal on its merits and in light of all representations made, the existing development within the area provides a relevant context for the proposal.
8. Consequently, within this context and for the above reasons, whilst the roof extension as proposed would alter the existing balance of the roof of the terrace and the relationship between No's 180 and 178, I am satisfied that its overall impact on the character of the dwelling and the terrace as a whole would not be unacceptably disruptive or inappropriately dominant. In addition, for similar reasons, the proposal would not be detrimental to the streetscene or the character of the area.
9. Notwithstanding the above issues, the size and siting of the side extension, the scale and design of the proposed rear dormer element and the rooflights to the front roofslope are not matters of contention between the parties. Having regard to the context of the site and the effect of these proposed elements on the visual amenities of the area, there is nothing before me that leads me to an alternative view in these respects.
10. Accordingly, overall and for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not conflict with the *London Plan* Policies 7.1 and 7.4, the *Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010* Core Policy 30 and the *Enfield Development Management Document 2014* Policy DMD 13, where they collectively seek to protect local character and appearance. It would also meet the aims of paragraph 17 of the

National Planning Policy Framework, to achieve high quality design and take account of the roles and character of different areas.

Other matters

11. Having regard to the siting, scale and design details of the proposal and its relationship to other properties nearby, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on neighbouring living conditions, including in relation to light, outlook and privacy.

Conditions and conclusions

12. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the use of matching external materials which, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, is necessary. In addition, for certainty, it is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Within the appeal submissions, the Council has not suggested any other conditions and, given the size, siting and relative height of the proposed side elevation window, I agree that it is not necessary in this case to require the use of obscure glazing.
13. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Napier

INSPECTOR