



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3240182
203, Middleham Road, Edmonton N18 2RY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Peter Cupi against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/01775/HOU, is dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as part single, part double storey side and back extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Peter Cupi against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling positioned within a corner plot in a predominantly residential area. The property already has a full width, single storey rear extension which projects from the original rear wall by approximately 3 metres. In addition, there is a full width dormer window at roof level and a further single storey side extension which runs level with the main front elevation and extends around half of the depth of the property.
5. It is proposed to erect a part single storey and part two storey side and rear extension. The finished effect would be a full depth two-storey side extension that would project beyond the existing rear elevation by around 3 metres thereby falling in line with the existing single storey rear extension.
6. The first floor of the front of the side extension would be set back by 0.5 metres and would be around 1.8 metres from the property boundary. In this regard the proposal would accord with Policy DMD 14 of the Enfield Council,

Development Management Document (ECDMD) 2014 which requires side extensions to be at least 1 metre from the property boundary.

7. The proposed side extension would result in a very deep, almost featureless gable wall that would extend beyond the depth of the original property by around 3 metres. Furthermore, this element would have a hipped roof design that would sit slightly lower than the ridge of the existing gable roof, wrapping round to and meet the existing dormer at the back, there would be a further elongated hipped section over the rear outrigger. The result would be an awkward juxtapose between several roof structures that would be out of keeping with the host property and the wider area where there is a strong prevalence of simple gable roofs. This would be contrary to the aims of Policy DMD13 of the ECDMD which requires that roof extensions do not disrupt the character or balance of the property or group of properties of which the dwelling forms a part.
8. I consider that the proposal would result in a series of dominant and incongruous structures that would appear out of place in the street scene and would, owing to their massing and bulk, appear out of scale with the host property. Consequently, the proposal would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, which would be further exacerbated by the prominent corner location of the property. This would mean that there would be open views of the extended property from a number of public vantage points. I therefore consider that the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMD8, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD 37 of the ECDMD as well as London Plan (2016) Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 which collectively, amongst other things, require that proposals have regard to their context, are of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing and have no adverse visual impact.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR