



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3276165

1 Brayton Gardens, Enfield, EN2 7LL

- 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 Neo Chambi against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/00500/HOU, dated 10 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single, part 2 storey rear extension, single storey side extension, creation of bay windows to ground and first floor front elevation, alterations to fenestration to side elevations together with rear dormer and front and side rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the decision notice is different to that on the application form. I have adopted the former as it more accurately describes the appeal proposal.
3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). However, the policies that are relevant to this appeal have not changed and there was no need, therefore, to invite the parties to make further submissions in response.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached property with gardens to the front and back, located on the western side of Brayton Gardens. Whilst the adjoining property, 3 Brayton Gardens (No.3), is also detached, it largely mirrors the design, style and form of the host property. Further to the south are a pair of semi-detached properties, that exhibit similar detailing to the host property and No.3, but differ in that they are attached and in the positioning of their front bay windows. Beyond this is another pair of detached properties that are again broadly symmetrical in terms of their detailing and style.

6. The proposed development includes a part single and part two storey extension at the rear of the host property, as well as alterations to the side windows. The Council have not raised any objection to these aspects of the application. Based on my observations on site, I concur with the Council's views in this respect. The remaining elements of the proposal include a single storey side extension, the creation of bay windows to the ground and first floor front elevation with linked pitched roof to a new porch and garage. In conjunction with a proposed rear dormer, the various hip ends to the existing roof would also be altered to create what the Council refer to as a 'crown' shaped roof, a large part of which, in the centre, would appear to comprise a flat roof.
7. A characteristic of the area is the general symmetry that is provided by the detailing, style and form of the host property and No.3, which, as I confirmed above, is repeated on other properties in the street. Whilst there are some differences, the two storey front bays and tiled overhangs that project forward from the hipped roofs of both the host and No.3 complement which other and the wider streetscene. Their relationship and largely mirrored design are a positive feature of the streetscene and make an important contribution to the built form and rhythm of this side of Brayton Gardens.
8. Within that context, the proposed works, to the front elevation and roof of the host property, would negatively transform its appearance and remove any symmetry that exists between it and No.3, and the wider streetscene. The whole architectural rhythm of this part of the street would be disrupted and the scale, form and massing of the proposed development on the front elevation would be excessive and harmful to the character of the host property and streetscene.
9. The level of harm would be accentuated by the detailed design of the proposed extensions, specifically the 'crown' roof shape, additional bay windows and new porch with linked pitched roof to the garage. All of these proposed works would result in a development that does not sit comfortably on the site and would look awkward in terms of its relationship to No.3. The positive contribution that the host property makes to the streetscene and the way it currently integrates well with No.3 would be completely lost, replaced by a proposed design that would be out of keeping and harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
10. Policies DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (EDMD) relate to house extensions and good quality design. Having regard to some of the relevant criteria to those policies, the appeal proposal would disrupt the character and balance of the host property and the pair and group of properties that it forms part of; the proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the host property and would be dominant when viewed from the surrounding area; the proposed development would not be subordinate or proportional to the original dwelling; and the proposal would not relate well to local distinctiveness or result in a high quality of design. Overall, the appeal proposal would conflict with a number of these criteria and thus with the objectives and aims of those policies.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be contrary to policy D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, policy DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the EDMD, policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010, and the corresponding policies of the Framework. These seek to ensure, amongst other

requirements, that residential extensions and alterations complement or improve the character of an area, harmonise with the host property and the streetscene, and respond positively to the proportions of the host building and surrounding properties. These policies are consistent with those in the Framework. The appeal proposal fails to meet these policy objectives resulting in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR