
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2020

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3257399
24 Raith Avenue, Southgate, N14 7DU

- 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 George Anastasis Michael against the decision of London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01151/HOU, dated 8 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear/side first-floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear/side first floor extension at 24 Raith Avenue in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01151/HOU, dated 8 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 location plan and DWG Nos. 19577/11, 19577/12, 19577/13, 19577/14, 19577/15 and 19577/16.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development upon i) the character and appearance of the area and ii) the living conditions of occupiers at No. 26 Raith Avenue.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Raith Avenue comprises pairs of semi-detached houses of similar appearance, which have been altered and extended over a significant period of time. I observed, during my site visit, the presence of single and two-storey extensions with flat, crown, gable and hipped roofs, as well as side dormer roof extensions and hip to gable roof extensions. As a result, the roofscape and spacing between dwellings varies considerably. Notwithstanding the diverse

range of extensions and alterations that have been undertaken, the area retains a very pleasant and cohesive appearance.

4. I am mindful of the fact that other extensions in the area may have been built without planning permission or may have been approved at a time when different policies were in place. I have determined this case on its own merits having regard to its current surroundings and current policies.
5. The proposed extension would have a flat roof, which would be in keeping with existing flat roof extensions to the host property and other flat roof extensions within the surrounding area. Whilst a crown roof would have been more aesthetically pleasing it is evident from the planning history that such a design was previously refused by the council. As the extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the house, by more than 5 metres, it would not be visually prominent within the street scene. It would only be visible in very limited views looking directly down the gap between 24 and 26 Raith Avenue.
6. Neither 24 nor 26 Raith Avenue has previously been extended at first floor level. Due to the location of the site on a slight bend in the road, the properties are also slightly splayed to the rear. As such there is a greater sense of space between these properties than there is between other pairs of semi-detached properties in the street and this would remain the case upon the completion of the extension. Accordingly there would be no terracing effect.
7. Concern has been raised regarding an overhang. This would be very small and would blend into the existing covered patio area. Due to its position at the rear of the property it would not be visible from outside of the site. The external render and the windows of the extension would match those of the existing dwelling.
8. I therefore conclude that the extension would not appear contrived or incongruous and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently it would not conflict with policies DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) adopted November 2014, policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (CS) adopted November 2010 or policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016, which collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development respects the character and quality of the local area. As the proposal does not relate to a new dwelling or a roof extension, policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD13 do not apply.

Living conditions

9. Neither party has provided me with a scale drawing showing the 30 degree line drawn from the nearest original first floor windows of the adjacent properties. Based upon my own observations, the proposed extension would not exceed this line. Moreover, I observed on my site visit that the nearest first floor window to No. 26 Raith Avenue is an obscure glazed bathroom window. It is located approximately 7-8 metres away from the proposed extension and due to the slightly splayed angle of the properties it also faces away from No. 24.
10. I therefore conclude that the extension would not result in any unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to No. 26 Raith Avenue. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with policies DMD11 and DMD14 of the Enfield Development Management Document, which seek to ensure that rear and side extensions do

not result in any adverse impacts upon occupiers of adjacent properties. As the proposal does not relate to a new dwelling, policy DMD8 does not apply.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the statutory time limit condition and a condition listing the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I have imposed a condition to ensure that the external materials match those of the existing dwelling in the interests of good design and protecting the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR