

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3253889

90 First Avenue, Enfield, London EN1 1BP

- 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 Rohan Chester against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00295/HOU, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'to create a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer, comprising of one no. bedroom with en-suite. The L-Shape dormer will accept two no. UPVC casement windows and 2 no. roof vision panels will be constructed into the roof of the dormer. To Extend the side pediment to be flush with the top of the dormer and to accept 2 no. UPVC windows'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity, I have added 'London' to the address in the banner heading above as it is more precise.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on a long linear residential road. The host dwelling is of brick construction with a tiled hipped roof. The proposal seeks alterations to the roof, through the introduction of a gable end, a dormer extension on the rear roof slope and a second-floor extension would be added to the existing 2-storey bay window on the side elevation.
5. On the same side of the road as the host dwelling and in the direction towards the junction with Second Avenue, the host dwelling forms part of a group of semi-detached houses that are similar in design. The wider street scene consists of a mixture of house types that also vary in design. On the same side of the road as the site, hipped roofs are a predominant feature that are clearly visible when viewed from the street. This forms a strong and positive characteristic in the street scene, meaning I consider that the appeal site is located within a row of similar properties that have maintained a sense of rhythm and balance and are then supported by other hipped roof dwellings on the same side of the road.

6. The proposal through its design and form, with particular regard to the proposed gable end and the second floor extension to the side bay window would result in incongruous additions that would dominate the property, fundamentally altering its shape and unbalancing its form and relationship with the adjoining dwelling. The resulting significant adverse effect on the host dwelling would be readily visible in the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There are misgivings in the design of the rear dormer, through excessive scale and massing, However, I do recognise that it would not be particularly visible from the street in this instance due to the proposed second floor extension to the side bay window.
7. Whilst I note the appellant's comments in relation to the fenestration, bay window, cleaned brickwork, amongst other things, I also acknowledge that the facing materials would likely be in keeping with the host property. However, these factors would not provide sufficient mitigation to outweigh the harm otherwise arising. In this instance, I do not consider that a suitably worded condition could be imposed to ensure that otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable.
8. My attention has been drawn to other alterations that have taken place on other dwellings in the street, including particular reference to a similar development¹ to the case before me, albeit without an additional storey added to its side bay window. Whilst noting the presence of the alterations at No 78 and to the other properties in the street, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the particular planning backgrounds. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between existing development and the case before me cannot be made, except insofar, as I was able to observe and assess No 78 and other sites at my visit. In any event, the fact that other development may exist, even if there are similarities to the appeal scheme, is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policies 7.4, 7.6 of the London Plan 2016; Policy CP30 of the Council's Core Strategy 2010 and Policies DMD 6, DMD 8, DMD 13, DMD 37 of the Development Management Document 2014 and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR

¹ No 78 First Avenue