



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2019

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3236251

24 Oak Avenue, Enfield EN2 8LB

- 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 C Capaldo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/01582/HOU, dated 29 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is raising of parts of the walls at first floor, proposed alterations to the roof, insertion of Velux rooflights and two new rear dormers.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is prominently located at the southern and lower end of Oak Avenue, a road with a pronounced slope. The existing house is two storeys in height and has a distinctive appearance. When viewed from the road, the left-hand side of the front elevation has a steeply pitched two storey gable end facing the highway, and to the right-hand side, the steep pitch is echoed in a dormer window at first floor level, albeit in a section of the building which has a lower eaves and ridge height.
4. To the left of the appeal site, there are a series of modest hipped roof bungalows and due to the prevailing topography, the eaves and ridge heights of these buildings progressively reduce towards the appeal site. The consistency of these design features, which derive from the land levels, establishes a strong element of uniformity within this section of the road. Consequently, the row of bungalows make a positive contribution to the wider street scene.
5. The steeply pitched gable end of the existing house replicates the staggered eaves heights of the neighbouring bungalows. However, the ridge height is considerably higher. The existing building is also substantially wider than the adjacent properties. As a consequence, due to its height, scale and appearance, the existing house has a somewhat dominant relationship with the adjacent bungalows.

6. The proposal would substantially increase the eaves height of the existing steeply pitched gable to the front of the property. Consequently, this element of the building would take a more conventional two storey appearance. In addition, the dormer window located to the other end of the building would be replaced by a two storey extension with an eaves height consistent with the existing building. When viewed from the front of the property, the effect of these alterations would be to substantially increase the bulk and mass of the building. The resultant dwelling would therefore overwhelm and dominate the scale of the adjacent buildings and consequently, the proposal would fail to be suitably respectful to the scale of the adjacent dwellings.
7. Elsewhere in the road, there is variety within the architecture of the buildings and there are many examples of houses that differ in height, form and appearance. In addition, there are examples of houses with large extensions and properties that are located close to each other. However, due to its height and scale the appeal site is already in stark contrast with the uniformity of the neighbouring bungalows. The proposal would substantially increase the overall bulk of the building and as a consequence, it would exacerbate an already imposing relationship between the buildings which in turn would be harmful to the street scene.
8. Accordingly, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016). Taken together, these policies seek high quality design that is appropriate to context.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR