

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2017

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3170767

46 Green Street, Enfield, EN3 7HQ

- 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 Frank Mc Donagh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 16/04696/HOU was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is: two storey side extension, and part single, part two storey rear extension and rear dormer roof extension with front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council has referred to policies DMD7 and DMD8 of the Development Management Document in its reasons for refusal. I agree with the appellant that these policies are less relevant because they concern development of garden land and standards for new residential development; respectively.

Reasons

4. No.46 Green Street is a two-storey dwelling with a single storey rear extension. It is located at the end of a short terrace of 3 buildings, which has distinctive sloping gables at either end of the front elevation. No.46 is situated at a prominent corner position and has a return frontage to Frederick Crescent. The gap in development between the side of No.46 and Frederick Crescent provides a sense of spaciousness at the road junction. At the other side of Frederick Crescent is a surgery which has a side extension. The surgery extension has retained some of the open character at the junction because it is only single storey in height and is set back from the side boundary with the road. Dwellings on the opposite side of the road from the appeal site at Edington Road have been extended, but with their single storey elements closest to their boundaries.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the boundary with Frederick Crescent by around 2.05 m at the front elevation, tapering down to approximately 1.55 m at the rear elevation. This would retain a degree of openness, although this effect would be reduced significantly because of the bulk of the extension at first floor level.

6. The extension would project forward of the general building line along Frederick Crescent. It would be visually prominent when viewed from Frederick Crescent because of the break in development created by the access to the primary school and access to garaging located at the rear of the appeal site. It would conflict with Development Management Document policy DMD 14 because, despite a separation distance from the nearest dwelling of around 50 m, it would fail to maintain a direct relationship with the established building line to the properties at the rear along Frederick Crescent and would close the gap in development at the road junction at first floor level.
7. It would not reflect the character of the local area and pattern of development, whereby dwellings at the junction of Green Street, Frederick Crescent and Edington Road have single storey elements closest to their boundaries. The proposed side extension would be unduly dominant in the street scene. It would also disrupt the symmetry in design of the front elevation of the terrace facing Green Street, because of its two-storey height and massing.
8. I agree with the appellant that the proposed rear dormer would meet the Council's quantitative guidelines. However, it would be a prominent addition because of its size and would be out of character with the other two dwellings in the terrace, which have no rear dormer windows. There would be conflict with Development Management Document policy DMD 13 which indicates, amongst other things, that rear dormers are required to be in keeping with the character of the property, and not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area.
9. Overall, the proposals would harm the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. The extensions would be contrary to policy CP30 of the Core Strategy (2010) which seeks to maintain the quality of the built environment. It would conflict with policy DMD 37 of the Development Management Document regarding design, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan concerning local character and architecture, and design objectives in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Considerations

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of other two storey side extensions to buildings with return frontages in Enfield. However, the particular site circumstances would have been different and their existence is insufficient reason to justify allowing this appeal.
11. The appellant has indicated that he could build a much larger dormer coupled with a gable end extension under permitted development rights which would cause more harm and would be more overbearing than the proposed dormer extension. No details are provided and I accord little weight to the suggestion. I have determined this appeal on the individual merits of the proposal having regard to development plan policies and all other material considerations.

Conclusion

12. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR