

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3167806
49 Cavendish Road, Edmonton, N18 2LT

- 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 Mrs Shirley Marie Cecile against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/04733/HOU dated 3 October 2016 was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a garage conversion to habitable room with bay window, part first floor side extension, conversion of loft space to bedroom and en-suite with rear dormer roof extension and 2 no. roof-lights to the front roof pitch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey house situated on the corner of Cavendish Road and Ellanby Crescent. The property has a single storey extension to the side. The surrounding area is predominately residential and is formed generally of short terrace blocks which mainly have hipped roof forms and are situated on regular building lines. Whilst many of the properties have been subject to alterations, the simple form and the spacing between and at the end of terraces, contributes to the character of the area.
4. The proposal includes a first-floor extension above the existing single storey addition to the side of the dwelling. The appeal application follows a previous appeal¹ that was dismissed and I note that the current proposal seeks to offset the first-floor element further away from the side boundary than the previous proposal. Whilst I note the step back from the front elevation, the lower ridge height and other elements such as the step back between the ground and first floors, which seek to reduce the visual bulk of the development, the proposal

¹ Ref: APP/Q5300/D/15/3022908

would still represent a marked increase in the mass and bulk of built form at the appeal site.

5. Despite the first floor being around 1.6m away from the side boundary, the development would result in around a 6.9m long wall along Ellanby Crescent, where it would appear as a visually dominant and overbearing feature in the streetscene. I have taken into account that this element of the proposal would utilise brick patterns and render but this, nor the use of design elements such as a bay window, would overcome the harm to the streetscene arising from a reduced sense of spaciousness.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and it would be contrary to Core Policy 30 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies DMD 14 and DMD 37 of Enfield's Development Management Document, which state, amongst other matters, that development that is inappropriate to its context or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings will be refused. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which looks to promote high quality design and seeks to ensure that development responds to local character.
7. The appeal development also includes a number of other elements, including a rear dormer, roof lights to the front and a bay window. The Council have raised no objections in relation to these elements and I have no reason to disagree. These elements do not however all appear to be separate from the first-floor side extension for me to issue a split decision.
8. I note the appellant has stated that the Local Planning Authority have not confirmed what would be supported. I am however required to deal with the appeal before me on its own merits. Whilst I appreciate that any further reductions would not allow adequate living space as required by the occupier, this is not a matter which outweighs my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR