



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3262947

54 Minchenden Crescent, London, N14 7EN

- 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 and Mrs Phil Mariutto against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/02191/HOU, dated 14 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor front extension together with hip to gable end roof extension with flank window, rear dormer with Juliet balconies and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed.
3. The Council's reason for refusing the application refers to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which relate to the quality of design and its contribution to local character. That plan has since been superseded by the London Plan 2021 (LP) which was published in March 2021. Policy D3 of the LP sets similar requirements for development with respect to the quality of design and how it responds to the local character. I have therefore determined the appeal with regard to policy D3 and am satisfied that neither party will be caused an injustice by taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the building and area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached 2 storey house. An existing side extension is set back behind the front building line and down from the roof ridge. It has a hipped roof reflecting the design of the original roof and that of the adjoining house. The proposed development would replace the side extension roof with a pitched roof extending to the gable end and to the full height of the main roof ridge. A rear dormer is proposed along most of the length of the roof.

6. I note that other houses within the street had extended their roofs by replacing a hipped roof with a gable end. However, the examples that I saw, including at Nos 48 and 62 cited by the appellant, appeared to relate to the original roof rather than that of a side extension. Also, in most cases the houses had 2 storey pitched roof bays projecting from the front elevation. The roof extensions sat behind these which to an extent limited their visual impact. This was the case with the extension at No 64, referred to by the appellant, which unlike the proposal extends below the ridge line and thus appears subservient to the main house.
7. The proposed development would substantially increase the ridge line and roof plane by extending up to the ridge and across to the gable end. The effect would be to elongate the roof and unbalance the composition of the semi-detached pair. The host building would appear significantly wider than that of its adjoining neighbour harming both the character and appearance of the house and street. This unbalancing effect, although most obvious from the street, would also impact on rear views of the property. It would be exaggerated by the addition of the rear dormer which would appear bulky and dominate the roof.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area and the proposal would conflict with policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (November 2010), policies DMD6, DMD13, and DMD37 of the Development Management Document (November 2014) and LP policies D3 and D6 which required high quality development of an appropriate scale that complements local character.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR