
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2019

by J.D.Westbrook BSc(Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3232089

5 Livingstone Road, London, N13 4SD

- 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 Mark Christodoulou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00562/HOU, dated 12 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey rear extension and a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear dormer. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the rear extension and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey rear extension at 5 Livingstone Road, London, N13 4SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/00562/HOU, dated 12 February 2019, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, insofar that they relate to the single-storey rear extension: 039-01, 039-05, 039-06, 039-07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed rear extension and rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and the area around Livingstone Road.

Reasons

3. No 5 is an end-terraced house situated on the western side of Livingstone Road. Livingstone Road is largely typified by terraced houses with two-storey rear outriggers and long rear gardens. The appeal property also has a large wrap-around side/rear conservatory, and a dormer window occupying most of the width of the rear roof slope.

4. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the existing conservatory and the construction of a larger wrap-around, single-storey side/rear extension. The extension would have a depth of 4m from the principal rear building line of the host property, a height of 2.9m, and it would occupy the whole width of the plot. The proposal would also involve the construction of a dormer extension above the first-floor of the rear outrigger to allow the creation of a bathroom. The dormer would effectively extend above the whole of the roof of the outrigger.
5. The Council contends that the proposed ground floor rear extension and dormer loft extension, by reason of their excessive size, depth, massing, siting, scale and contrived poor design, when considered cumulatively and in isolation, would have an obtrusive, incongruent and discordant appearance that would fail to harmonise with the scale, form and architectural compositions of the original building and the established local character. They would therefore be out of keeping and character with the host property and the surrounding area.

The single-storey rear extension

6. The existing conservatory would appear to project around 2.5 metres beyond the rear elevation of the rear outrigger. It is approximately in line with the rear elevation of a single-storey extension at the rear of the adjoining No 7. There are a number of single-storey extensions at the rear of houses in the vicinity of the appeal property, including some longer than that of the current proposal.

Conditions

7. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR