
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3255371
68 Cedar Avenue, Enfield EN3 7JD

- 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. U. Avcu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01289/HOU, dated 22 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor side and rear extension together with extension to roof at side to form gable end with rear dormer and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the proposal's description as set out on the Council's Decision Notice as it better focusses on the development involved.
3. The previously existing side and rear extensions have been demolished and the Council has confirmed that works to implement approval for a part single, part two-storey side extension¹ have begun (the approved scheme). Although the details of the approved scheme are not before me, I observed during my site visit that the rear façade of the single storey extension has been constructed beyond the corresponding extension to 66 Cedar Avenue. However, the floor plans and elevations for the appeal proposal show the single storey rear extension to be aligned with the rear façade of the extension at No 66. With this in mind, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the development shown on the plans referenced: Location Plan, 025.20/01, 025.20/02, 025.20/03, 025.20/04, 025.20/05 and 025.20/06.
4. Given that Policies (II)GD3 and (II)H15 of the Unitary Development Plan no longer appear to form part of the Council's Development Plan, except where indicated, I have determined the appeal in light of the policies referred to in the Officer Report and Decision Notice.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

¹ Planning Reference: 18/04422/HOU.

Reasons

6. The appeal concerns a two-storey semi-detached house situated within a residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached houses, evenly spaced along the street and with hipped roofs and bay windows. There are varying forms of two-storey side extensions to houses within Cedar Avenue and other streets nearby. While some incorporate flat roofs, the majority have hipped roofs arranged with identical eaves heights.
7. Despite the design of the proposal reflecting elements of existing extensions found within the locality and its height being lower than the existing roof, the varied design and form of the roof would appear at odds with the simple hipped roof of the host property. The proposed dormer window would be inset from the eaves, ridge and the edge of the roof. However, in conjunction with the other elements of the proposal, including the wrap around nature of the first-floor rear extension, the appearance, scale and form of the existing house would be unrecognisable and overwhelmed.
8. The existing first floor extension at No 66 is stepped away from the boundary and the proposed first floor side extension would be set back of and down from the roof of the appeal property. However, it would abut the boundary, thereby drawing the houses uncomfortably close together at first floor, which would jar with the established characteristic spacing between the pairs of houses in the street. The resultant spacing would be more synonymous with the terraces found to the west.
9. I have had regard to the extensions to other houses to which I have been referred. Although the property located at 95 Swan Way² benefits from a gable end roof extension, that is only part of the proposal before me; the houses to the west around No 46 are rows of terraced houses with gable ends; and the allowed appeal³ was determined in a different policy context, prior to the adoption of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD). For these reasons, they are not comparable with the appeal scheme before me which I have, in any event, considered on its own individual merits.
10. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Hence, the proposal would conflict with the design aims of Policy 7.4 of The London Plan (2016) (TLP); Policy CP30 of the Council's Core Strategy; Policies DMD13, DMD14, and DMD37 of the DMD and the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. I have not found in relation to Policy 7.1 of the TLP and Policy DMD8 of the DMD, as these relate to new buildings and residential development, respectively. Moreover, they are not relevant to the consideration of proposals for extensions to existing residential properties.

Other Matters

12. I appreciate that the proposal would provide additional accommodation that would be beneficial to the occupants of the appeal property and it would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, but consideration of these matters does not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.

² Referenced in the Appellant's Statement 95 Swan Walk.

³ Appeal Reference: APP/Q5300/D/12/2178066

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR