



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2021

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3258156 58 Curzon Avenue Enfield EN3 4UE

- 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 Mrs Violeta Stirbu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
The application Ref 20/01775/HOU, dated 10 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is part single, part 2-storey side extension, single storey rear extension together with extension to roof at side to form gable end with rear dormer and new front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development, this is also the description used by the Appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above rather than the appellants description of development.
3. Since the submission of the appeal the London Plan 2021 has been published. The Council's reason for refusal includes policies within the London Plan 2016. The London Plan 2021 does not diverge significantly from the previous plan in terms of seeking to create a strong sense of place and achieve high quality design appropriate to the local context. No party has been prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area, characterised typically by terraced two-storey properties and semi-detached bungalows. Some properties in the area have been altered and/or extended in a variety of ways. The appeal site is an end terraced two-storey property.

6. In general properties in the area have an architectural rhythm with balanced features, whilst there are some properties which have been altered the original roof features are still identifiable within the streetscene. The front the terraced block which the appeal site forms part of has a hipped side roof on each end terraced property which provides symmetry and contributes to the character of the area. The proposed gable roof would be an incongruous feature within the streetscene.
7. The rear dormer would be large, covering the majority of the rear roof plane, policy DMD13 requires roof dormers to be inset from the eaves, ridges and edges of the roof. The proposed dormer is not inset from the ridge, nor the shared boundary with the adjoining property and inset a minimal distance from the eaves and north side elevation. The proposed dormer would dominate the rear elevation and would be out of keeping with the existing property and the surrounding area.
8. The Council have not raised concerns with regard to scale of the proposed side and rear extensions, notwithstanding the roof detail, and based on the information I have before me I do not disagree.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), Policies DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policies within the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seeks to create a strong sense of place, achieve good design appropriate to the local context. The development would also be contrary to the Framework which seeks to secure good design which adds to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

10. The Appellant considers that the proposed gable roof and dormer would constitute permitted development, the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B does permit the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof subject to criteria. However, the proposed development involves the erection of a two-storey extension which would facilitate the proposed alterations to the roof, the alterations to the roof could not be carried out in the form proposed without the two-storey extension which requires planning permission. Therefore, the proposed development is much more than an addition or alteration to the roof.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR