

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021 by Max Webb

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3278450

76 Monmouth Road, Edmonton N9 0LG

- 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 M Ahmed against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/01254/HOU, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site forms part of a semi-detached pair, on a street with similarly sized semi-detached pairs. The street has a somewhat consistent appearance with predominantly hipped roofs and single storey side projections being a common feature. The appeal property has a conforming single storey side projection, though the property features a gable rather than pitched roof form and a large box dormer and ground floor projection to the rear.

6. The proposal seeks to add a first-floor wrap around extension to the side and rear of the property. The side element of the extension would be above the existing single storey projection. Although set back slightly from the front elevation and not breaching the building line to the side, it would still add additional bulk above ground floor level to the side of the property that would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. Whilst the separation distance to the next property means there may not be a clear terracing effect, the side element of the extension would be a clearly visible interruption to the single storey side projections seen on this road. The side element would thus not have an appropriate level of regard for the surrounding context and would visibly harm the character of the frontage.
7. The vegetation to the side of the appeal site was not in leaf during the site visit so did not prevent significant views of the side of the dwelling. Even if in full leaf, there would still be glimpse views of the appeal site and the vegetation would not prevent views of the property from other angles in the street scene.
8. The proposal would also include a rear element over an existing rear projection. Due to the presence of the existing box dormer on the rear roof slope and the large ground floor projection, the addition of an extension at first floor level would add further bulk that would appear out of keeping. Other rear development in the vicinity does not add similar levels of bulk, particularly at first floor level, and therefore despite a varied character to the rear of dwellings on this street, do not appear out of keeping.
9. The proposed extension would include a pitched roof form. On the side elevation, although matching the pitch of the main roof slope, its positioning would conflict with the existing gable roof form and would appear incongruous. Many visible projections and extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site have flat roofs which helps to achieve subservience. On the rear elevation the pitched roof would contradict with the roof forms of both the box dormer and ground floor projections on the host dwelling and would give the rear of the property a cluttered appearance. It would thus not appear unified with the host dwelling.
10. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (adopted 2010) which aims to ensure that development is design-led and has regard to its context. It would also go against the aims of Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014) which together look to ensure proposals have an appropriate scale, bulk, massing and form, with particular regard to the visual impact of rear and side extensions, to ensure development has an appropriate regard for its surroundings.
11. The Council have referred to Policies D1, D4 and D8 of the London Plan (adopted 2021). D1 is strategic in nature and D8 refers primarily to the public realm, and they are therefore not greatly relevant to this householder development. D4 refers to the design review processes for applications and is therefore also not particularly relevant to this appeal.

Other Matters

12. Although the proposal may not result in any harm to highway safety or residential amenity, this does not diminish the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR