



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: 26 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3240342

7 Southbury Avenue, Enfield EN1 1RH

- 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 A Mazintas against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03019/HOU dated 28 August 2019 was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
 - The proposal is described as single storey side and rear extensions, first floor side extension, conversion of hipped to gabled roof and the erection of a rear dormer window.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey end of terrace property located on the east side of Southbury Avenue. There is a mixture of properties with different roof forms around the junction with Lincoln Road, however, the appeal site and majority of the properties along Southbury Avenue share similar traditional designs which generally consist of modest terraces with hipped roofs. This provides a sense of consistency which gives a pleasant visual characteristic when viewed from the street and a strong sense of local distinctiveness.
5. There are gaps in between the terraces, and although I witnessed some low-key development within these gaps at ground floor level, gaps at first floor level were a strong characteristic. I also witnessed many front roof lights and some rear dormers to the terraces, including at the neighbouring property No.9. Most of these dormers appeared to be subordinate in nature due to the insets from the eaves, ridge and sides.
6. The proposed side extension would have a gable roof above it. This style of roof would appear incongruous and conspicuous given the traditional hipped

styles of roof forms present within the surrounding vicinity, regardless of the obtuse angle of the extension. It would be a considerable deviation from the characteristic roofscape of its neighbours along Southbury Avenue and would disrupt the balance of the terrace it is a part of. Furthermore, although set in from the side boundary, the extension would still appear as a large, prominent addition at first floor level in the gap to the side of the house, contrasting with the generally open gaps at first floor level between the terraces nearby.

7. The proposed rear dormer would span the full width of the roof, including above the proposed first-floor side extension and would have a minimal set down from the ridge and setback from the eaves. Whilst rear dormers are not uncommon within the surrounding area, the proposed dormer, due to the lack of insets, would appear to be a dominant addition to the roofscape when viewed from the surrounding area.
8. I note the Certificates of Lawful Development for the hip to gable roof extension and ground floor side extension, and the confirmation that prior approval is not required for the ground floor rear extension. Indeed, the Council do not raise any concerns regarding the ground floor rear and side extensions, and I have no reason to agree. However in my view, these permitted extensions would not be as substantial as the proposal now before me. So, whilst I recognise these other developments are realistic fall-back positions, as acknowledged by the Inspector in appeal ref: APP/U5930/W/17/3176385, they are not comparable to the development before me which would be harmful for the reasons given above.
9. I witnessed various front rooflights along Southbury Avenue and due to the general low-key nature of them, I do not find this element of the proposal to be harmful. This however does not mitigate the harm identified above.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy, 2010-2025 and Policies DMD6 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document, Adopted November 2014, (DMD) which together seek to ensure developments are well designed, have no visual impact, and protect the character of the area. This is further echoed in Policy 7.4 of The London Plan, March 2016. It would further conflict with Policy DMD13 of the DMD which seeks to ensure roof extensions are appropriately sized.
11. The proposed development would not create a terracing effect and would be set in 1m from the boundary of the adjoining property. As such, I do not find conflict with Policy DMD14 of the DMD. Notwithstanding this, the adherence to this policy would not outweigh the conflict found with the other relevant policies as described above.

Recommendation and Conclusion

12. 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

13. 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