



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1st August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3175647

51 Oakwood Crescent, Southgate, London N21 1PA

- 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 Colin Allison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/05896/HOU, dated 14 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in a residential area and comprises a two storey semi-detached house which has accommodation in the roof space derived from an earlier hip to gable extension and associated large rear dormer. It occupies a splayed plot which becomes progressively wider towards the rear of the site. Running between the appeal property and No 49 Oakwood Crescent is a footpath which leads to Oakwood Park. The front, flank and rear of the house are therefore visible in public views and in this respect it is a prominent location.
4. A key element of the original character of the dwelling and other properties in the immediate area are the flanks run at a right angle to the front elevation of the respective houses. The same applies to original side elements such as the attached single storey garage at the appeal site. In the majority of cases, subsequent side extensions in the locality have also adhered to this design principle.
5. Instead of following the established pattern of development, the proposed side extension would run parallel to the splayed site boundary and be set in by 1m. The shape of the site has therefore inappropriately led the design of the proposed scheme rather than the existing character of the house and the other dwellings in the street scene. Due to the uncharacteristic angled flank of the

- side extension, it would appear as an awkward and alien addition within its prominent context.
6. The departure from the established pattern of development would have further adverse consequences. It would result in a complex roof form at the front and side with certain pitches that are unfamiliar to the existing character of the house and other properties in the locality. Whilst the proposed crown roof forms at the rear would not reflect the original character of the house, they would follow the approach that has been adopted to the existing dormer along with the bay beneath and so would not be jarring features in themselves.
 7. At the rear, the extended ground floor habitable space would be as wide as the original house and it would be close to being as wide at the first floor level. Viewed in combination with the existing roof extensions, the proposed alterations by reason of their size and bulk would appear as disproportionate and discordant additions to the original character and appearance of the host property.
 8. For the reasons set out above and notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials, the scheme would represent poor quality design and the resulting incongruous appearance of the property would fail to harmonise with and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 9. The benefit of the proposed development is acknowledged, namely the provision of additional living accommodation at a family home. Nevertheless, this consideration does not outweigh the identified harm.
 10. It is therefore concluded that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 and Policies DMD 11, DMD 13, DMD 14 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) 2014. Amongst other things, these policies seek to resist development that is inappropriate to its context or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out that planning should always seek to secure high quality design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON