



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3240839

1 Landseer Road, Enfield EN1 1DP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Douglas Smith against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02939/HOU dated 21 August 2019 was refused by notice dated 30 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "alterations/extension to a single dwellinghouse at 1 Landseer Road including a porch to the front door and a two storey extension at the rear; ground and first floor, to create an extended eat-in kitchen downstairs a third bedroom/home office upstairs."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The appellant refers to an error within drawing ref:08A Proposed Elevation and Section regarding the proposed ridge height of the extension as shown in the side/north elevation. The appellant states it should be as shown on the proposed rear/west elevation within drawing ref: 07A Front and Rear Elevations. I have taken this into account.
4. From my site visit, it could be seen the porch had already been constructed. As such I will deal with this element of the proposal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Landseer Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site is a two-storey end of terrace property and is situated in an established residential area. Most of the houses along Landseer Road have adjoining bay windows, with the appeal site having its own bay unattached due to its end of terrace position. Common features along Landseer Road are recessed entry ways with arched openings. The arches are at times shared over two entrances and also serve individual entrances, such as at the appeal site. The arched features are an established design and provide a strong sense of uniformity within the street scene. There are some porches present along Landseer Road which adjoin the bays and share the same roof lean-to roof form, however, these are not a dominant feature of the street scene.
7. The porch contains a pitched roof with a forward-facing gable end. It does not adjoin the bay window but matches its height and is aligned with its depth. The pitched roof form and protrusion of the porch from the main entrance is at odds with the established appearance of the street scene. The porch also conceals the characteristic arched feature prominent along Landseer Road. It therefore fails to maintain the established character of the street scene and is an incongruous addition. I note the various porches the appellant refers to along Landseer Road, but none of these have the pitched roof design present in the porch at the appeal site. For these reasons, the porch element of the planning appeal is harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The rear elevation of the appeal property partly contains a two-storey outrigger where the slope of the main roof continues over this, down to the rear elevation of the outrigger. This configuration is repeated across the terrace the appeal property is a part of and, due to its unique design, it is a characteristic feature of the terrace and provides a strong sense of local distinctiveness. The fenestration arrangements witnessed along the rear of the terrace at first floor level vary in style but are generally simple two or three pane windows. Most of the development to the rear of the terrace consists of modest single storey rear extensions. The neighbouring property at No.3 however has had an extension at first floor level by increasing the height of the outrigger and altering the roof slope, which is the sole departure from the consistent roof form of the terrace.
9. The proposed rear element of the development would eradicate the continuous slope of the roof over the outrigger by extending upwards, beyond the height of the neighbouring outrigger at No.3 to just below the properties ridge line. It would also extend beyond the rear elevation of the outrigger at this height, creating a deeper and higher outrigger with a mono pitched roof form. Whilst the depth may match the single storey extensions within the terrace, it is clearly significantly higher. The proposed development, even with matching materials, would fail to respect the design and form of the original dwelling by reason of its significant height, bulk and mono pitched roof design. Furthermore, the proposed Juliet balcony at first floor level would fail to harmonise with the fenestration arrangement of the house and wider terrace. As such, the extension would disrupt the uniformity at the rear of the terrace, be a discordant addition and would detract from the distinctive character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant states the proposed development at the rear would be akin to the rear elevations at Poynter Road. However, the properties in Poynter Road

are distinctly different in terms of the design of their rear outriggers and an extension reflecting the design of those properties would not harmonise well with the host dwelling and immediate surroundings of the appeal site.

11. Consequently, the porch does, and the rear extension would, harm the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore conflicts with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy, 2010-2025, (Core Strategy) and Policies DMD6, DMD11, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document, Adopted November 2014, (DMD) which seek to ensure development is well designed, has no visual impact, and protects the character of the area. This is further echoed in Policies 7.1 and 7.4 of The London Plan, March 2016, (London Plan).

Living Conditions

12. The proposed flank wall of the development at the rear would be positioned close to the boundary of No.3 and the first-floor rear window present on the outrigger. This window is obscurely glazed which is typical for a bathroom rather than a habitable room. It would therefore be reasonable to consider that even if the proposal would have a dominating or overbearing impact on the outlook from the first-floor rear window of No.3, it would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of this property.
13. For these reasons, the proposed rear element of the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Landseer Road. I therefore do not find conflict with Policy DMD 11 of the DMD which seeks to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties and Policy DMD 13 of the DMD which further seeks to ensure development is not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area, which I consider includes neighbouring properties.
14. The Council refer to Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy and Policy 7.1 of the London Plan which mainly relate to improving the quality of the built and open environment, and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan which relates to local character. I do not find conflict with these policies with regard to living conditions.

Other Matters

15. I understand the appellant is willing to undertake changes to the proposed fenestration arrangements and roof pitch. However, I can only consider the appeal based on the drawings before me.
16. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant's need to extend the property to accommodate his family and avoid relocating, these personal circumstances are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Recommendation and Conclusion

17. Although the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Landseer Road, this does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR