
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Richard Schofield BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3161495
33 Bourne Avenue, Southgate N14 6PA

- 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 Alex Theodore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/03499/FUL, dated 29 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of rear outhouse and garage and erection of a part single storey side extension with integral garage, part single, part 2-storey rear extension, first floor front and rear dormer and alterations to the front entrance hall window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It is evident from the officer's report and the decision notice that the Council's sole concern with the appeal scheme is the proposed change to the roof arising from the two-storey nature of the rear extension. No objections are raised to the single-storey aspects of the scheme. I have no reason to depart from this view and, thus, my decision focuses on the matter of the two-storey rear extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Meadway Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. The Conservation Area is comprised of mature suburban residential streets. Its special interest is derived from the distinctive collection of cottage style detached and semi-detached houses, typical of the interwar period's amalgam of historic architectural influences. These are set within deep, relatively narrow plots, which together form an attractive landscaped backdrop to the dwellings. Houses are varied in design, but share common features including prominent chimneys, red brick and render facades, and varying roof heights, further broken up by characteristic protruding, sometimes angled, front and/or rear half width bays.
-

5. No 33 is a well-proportioned detached house with a simple hipped roof. This is relieved by a typically subservient front gable extension, as well as a catslide roof down to the front door. It forms a pair with No 31, and sits within a staggered run of dwellings that wraps around the bend from Bourne Avenue into Meadway. It is typical of the dwellings in the Conservation Area and, as such, makes a positive contribution to it.
6. The proposed two-storey extension would push the host dwelling quite significantly into the rear garden, extending the entire main roof back by several metres. This would give rise to an uncharacteristic increase in the bulk of the dwelling, unrelieved by any characteristic variation in roof height or width.
7. Although it would not be not readily apparent from the public realm, the mass of the two-storey extension would be clearly visible from surrounding properties, most notably from the rear of No 35 (both house and garden) and from the side elevation and the rear garden of No 31. It would appear as a disproportionate and intrusive addition to No 33, and as an incongruous feature in what are otherwise, particularly from the first floor and garden of No 35, open outlooks over surrounding rear gardens (which form an integral part of the verdant character of the Conservation Area).
8. The appellant has suggested that the appeal proposal would create a more balanced design than that of the extension already permitted, notably by centralising the rear dormer. This may be so, but there are no plans of the extant permission before me and the Officer's report indicates that the permitted scheme had a more subservient and characteristic roof form. As such, I cannot be certain that the overall design and form of the permitted scheme is not a more appropriate addition in overall design terms than the appeal proposal.
9. I find that the appeal proposal would give rise to harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. This harm would be less than substantial, but no public benefits have been advanced to be balanced against this. As such, there is nothing that would lead me to the conclusion that the harm is outweighed.
10. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Meadway Conservation Area. As such, it would conflict with policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy, and policies DMD6, DMD13, DMD37 and DMD44 of the Enfield Development Management Document. These seek, among other things, to ensure that new development, including roof extensions, is of a high quality design; has regard to the special character and interest of heritage assets; has no adverse visual impact; is of an appropriate size; and is in keeping with the character of the host property.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Schofield

INSPECTOR