

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2017

by Sue Glover BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3167817
183 Great Cambridge Road, Enfield, EN1 1SG

- 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 K Krishnajoathy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/05289/HOU was refused by notice dated 19 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is an alteration to the roof for part of the side hip gable wall and a rear dormer with roof windows.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The Council refers in its decision to an existing single storey extension at the rear of no. 183. However, the description in the application to the Council and repeated in the banner heading above, did not include the single storey extension. I have therefore not considered the existing rear extension as part of the application and this appeal.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. This part of the street on this side is characterised by rows of terraces, predominantly with hipped roof gables at the each end of the terrace, and with prominent bay windows. The terraces have a regular, symmetrical appearance with gaps maintained between them. The hipped gable end of no. 183 is seen in the context of the adjacent end of terrace house, no. 181, which also has an original hipped gable end and a similar eaves height.
 5. The proposal would extend the roof at the side with a "Dutch" style gable end with raised eaves, a higher flank end wall and a rear dormer. Whilst the gap between terraces is only visible from fairly short views in the street, the proposed alterations with their distinctly different design from the original hipped roof would appear prominent and out of keeping.
-

6. Whilst not a "poor" design taken on its own, in the context of the design of the adjacent dwelling and the terraces as a whole, the proposal would appear alien and asymmetrical in appearance. In this respect, there would not be a high quality of design. Although there are 2 other dwellings with roof extensions, these are further down the street and they do not justify an unsympathetic design at the appeal dwelling. The proposed roof dormer, whilst unable to be built without an extended side roof, would be set back from the side and it therefore would not appear visible in the street scene.
7. Taking all these matters into account, the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace and the surrounding area. There would be conflict with Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 -2025, which indicates that developments must be high quality and have special regard to their context. There would also be conflict with Policy DMD 13 of the Development Management Document, which seeks to ensure that side roof extensions must not disrupt the character or balance of the property, and with Policy DMD 37, which seeks to resist any development that is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings.
8. The development plan objectives are consistent with those set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraphs 17 and 60 seek to secure a high quality of design, and to reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposal does not meet the objectives of the Framework in these respects.
9. My attention has been drawn to an appeal decision relating to a property elsewhere in the Borough. I do not have all the details of this other proposal, and I have therefore judged this proposal on its own individual merits.
10. I have taken into account all other matters, including the benefit of enhanced living space for residents. I have also considered all the policies in the Framework, and other national planning policy and guidance. Notwithstanding the other matters, the harm that I have identified to character and appearance is significant and overriding. The appeal does not succeed.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR
