

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2016

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3157110
14 Sutherland Road, Enfield EN3 4LZ

- 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 Veli Bunul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/02154/HOU, dated 17 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's refusal notice as this more accurately describes the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Site and proposal

4. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling in a predominantly residential area. To the side of the dwelling there are a number of allotments. The property includes a two storey outrigger to the rear and the walls and roof of a single storey flat roofed extension which appears to have already been partly built pursuant to planning permission No 15/05788/PRH. The property has a rear garden and there is another row of terraced houses facing the rear of the dwelling which are located off Nelson Street. The rear of the appeal property can be seen across the allotment land from the car parking area serving apartments off Nelson Street.
 5. It is proposed to erect a two storey side and rear extension. The two storey side extension would be set back by about 7.0 metres from the front of the house and would be built 1.3 metres from the side wall of the property. At its narrowest point it would be 0.7 of a metre from the side boundary facing the allotment land. The two storey development would wrap around the rear of the
-

dwelling where there is an existing recessed area and is proposed to be in line with the existing two storey outrigger. It would include a pitched roof and, given its relationship with the existing two storey outrigger, would have the effect of creating a "valley" roof.

6. A single storey rear extension would be built beyond the two storey rear development which would project about 3.0 metres further into the garden and across the full width of the rear of the dwelling. It would have a flat roof and would be approximately 3.0 metres high.

Character and appearance

7. When considered in isolation, the single storey extension would be acceptable in terms of its scale and rear projection. It would accord with the Council's policies in this regard. When compared to the prior approval permission, which allows the erection of a 6.0 metre long kitchen extension, it would better reflect the scale and proportions of the original dwelling. However, this part of the proposal is not severable from the rest and it is necessary to consider the proposal in its totality.
8. The two storey side extension would be set back from the front of the house by a considerable distance. Therefore, it would not look out of place or detract from the proportions or architectural features of the original house when viewed from Sutherland Road. However, the two storey extension would have a very high eaves height and therefore would include a significant mass of walling. It would not appear subordinate in scale to the original dwelling when viewed from the allotment land, from the other terraced dwellings to the rear, or from the car parking areas in Nelson Road. Furthermore, the development as whole would be large and out of proportion with the original house and would detract from the scale and pattern of development to the rear of properties in the remainder of the terrace.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that in some respects the proposed two storey development would seek to mirror the scale and roof design of the existing two storey outrigger, the provision of a valley roof would appear incongruous in its setting. There are no other roofs which are designed in this way in the immediate locality.
10. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would have a significantly detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would not accord with the design aims of Core Policy 30 of the adopted Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies DMD8, DMD11, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document 2014.

Other Matters

11. I note that the appellant does not consider that the development would be conspicuous from the public realm. I do not share this view as the rear of the dwelling can be seen from Nelson Street, from existing terraced houses to the rear and from the allotment land to the side. In any event, the National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 56 that "*good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people*".

12. I understand that there were some pre-application discussions with the Council prior to the submission of the planning application. I have not been provided with the exact discussions that have taken place with the Council, but there does appear to be some suggestion that the "valley" roof might be acceptable. Nonetheless, I have determined this appeal on its planning merits and I am not bound by any prior discussions that took place with the Council. In any event, the two storey development is unacceptable for reasons other than the incongruous valley roof.
13. I note that there does appear to be a relatively new two storey side extension at No 15 Sutherland Road which also abuts the allotment land. I do not know the exact circumstances which led to this development being constructed or allowed. In any event, I have determined this application against the most up to date planning policies, and for the collective reasons outlined above, I do not consider that the appeal proposal would constitute good design and significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR