
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc DipTP (Cert Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3235631

31 Roundhill Drive, Enfield, EN2 7RW

- 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 Tommy Gjetta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/02191/HOU, dated 14 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part 2-storey side extension, involving changing an existing extension flat roof to pitch tile roof and the relocation of a front entrance door.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling which flanks onto Roundhill Drive. It is two storeys with additional accommodation with the roof in the form of a rear flat roofed dormer. This extends across much of the rear roof slope and is visible from the road. The surrounding area comprises dwellings of similar original construction and design, with some extended to the rear.
4. The extended dwelling at ground floor level would not be unduly prominent or visually intrusive being single storey. However, the two storey flank extension would be unsympathetically designed by reason of its angled nature relative to the existing squarer shape of the dwelling. It would also project beyond the rear of the existing dwelling creating a deep side elevation adjacent to the street. Such an awkward and dominant design would result in a visually contrived and incongruous appearance to the extended dwelling and would result in an adverse visual impact. In this regard, the first floor extension's size, design, siting and poor connection with the existing dwelling would not result in a visually positive or comfortable appearance to the development when seen from the street.
5. There has been a similar development granted planning permission on an end of terrace dwelling in Grenoble Gardens which also has an existing roof dormer

extension. Here, the permitted extension was more extensive and projected beyond the rear dormer when viewed from the rear. However, this development would not have been as prominent as the appeal proposal. It did not flank a road and is in a different area of Enfield. For these reasons, there are material differences between the two schemes. Notwithstanding this, every proposal has to be considered on its particular planning merits and inevitably, proposals for this type of development will differ from one another because of site context and scheme details.

6. Taking all these factors into account, the development would not be of a high quality architecture or design and would harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 - 2025 (2010) and policies DMD 11 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014.
7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR