



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2019

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3229626

72 Montagu Crescent, Edmonton N18 2HA

- 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 Veysel Arslan against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00774/HOU, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is for demolition of the garage on the side and the erection of a two storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues of this appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. 72 Montagu Crescent is an end of terrace house, with front, side and rear garden, which provides a plot that appears to be larger than the average for the area, that is made up of similar simple terraces within an extensive planned estate.
4. On the flank side of the host property is a parking area, to the rear of which is a terrace that sits significantly back from the street than other terraces that front Montague Crescent. This layout makes the flank wall of the host property and its detached garage appear prominently in the street scene of the area and provides open views into the rear gardens with mature trees of the terrace that includes the host property.
5. The proposed development is a two storey side and rear extension to the existing 3 bedroom host property that would replace the existing single

detached garage, that sits at an oblique angle to the flank wall of the host property. The front of the proposal would be set back from, but parallel with, the front elevation of the existing dwelling. The front elevation would extend almost to the side boundary of the property and would be equivalent to approximately half the width of the existing dwelling. Although slightly lower than the apex of the roof of the host dwelling, the proposed extension would follow the existing hipped roof form and match the existing eaves height.

6. The depth of the proposed extension would be greater than that of the existing house reaching back beyond the rear elevation of the existing house, in front of the side extension to 70 Montagu Crescent (No 70), that forms the end of the terrace at the rear of the carpark. The proposal would result in a significant apparent increase in the scale of the existing dwelling, with a corresponding increase in size and prominence of its flank wall.
7. Although the existing terraces are simple in form and generally plain in expression, there is nonetheless a sense of spaciousness and openness arising from a consistent architectural approach and the set-back and spacing between terraces. The scale and position of the proposal relative to its plot and its neighbours would, therefore, result in the proposal failing to appear subservient to the host dwelling. It would unduly assert itself within an area of defined and coherent character and would impose itself on wider views of the area.
8. Consequently, I find that the position and bulk of the proposed new dwelling relative to its plot and prominent position would result in an unduly prominent appearance. For this reason, the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the street scene within an area of defined and coherent character, conflicting with Policies DMD8, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document (DMD), which collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, are of a high quality design, take into account the nature of the surrounding area and its character, and of appropriate scale, subordinate to the original dwelling, with no adverse visual impact.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed 2 storey extension would project significantly to the side and rear of the existing dwelling and would be positioned in proximity to the extended house at No 70 that sits to the side and rear of the appeal property. This would place the proposed extension in front of ground and first floor windows of No 70, especially those in its side extension.
10. Notwithstanding that the appellants light study appears to demonstrate that there would be a minimal impact on sunlight and daylight to the occupiers of this dwelling, the scale and location of the proposed extension would result in it being experienced by the occupiers of No 70 as an enclosing and oppressive presence.
11. The proposal would therefore be visually intrusive to the residential occupiers at No 70, to the degree that it would result in unacceptable harm to their living conditions. As such it would be contrary to Policies DMD8 and DMD11 of the DMD, which concern the protection of living conditions as far as they seek to

ensure that development is compatible with existing development in the local area and respects the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings, including outlook.

Other matters

12. I acknowledge the appellants view that the extension would better meet the needs of existing and future occupiers of the dwelling. However, in general, planning decisions should be made in the wider public interest. In this context, the harm I have identified is significant and it outweighs these benefits. Dismissing the appeal is a proportionate response in this instance.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR