



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3292487
78A Brimsdown Avenue, Enfield EN3 5ER

- 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 Ms Nadine Pringle against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/04597/HOU, dated 9 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site comprises an end of terrace house with a pitched and hipped roof at 78A Brimsdown Avenue. The property at the other end of the terrace features a pitched and partly hipped roof to its side.
4. No 78A is the result of a sideways addition to the original terrace. Furthermore, other properties in the vicinity appear to have been extended and altered to their sides. There is also some house type variety nearby, with the adjacent property notably being a recently constructed detached house. However, the immediate part of Brimsdown Avenue mostly features terraced properties with pitched and hipped roofs. No 78A is reflective of the surrounding properties in this respect and contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal includes the addition of a rear dormer, a hip-to-gable extension, a window in the resulting gable end of the house, and rooflights in the front roof plane. The Council has raised no issues with the dormer or the rooflights. Although the hip-to-gable extension would need to be created for the dormer and some of the additional openings to be constructed, I have no compelling reasons to reach a different view to the Council regarding those specific aspects of the development.
6. The hip-to-gable extension would be a relatively modest addition and be constructed using materials that would be compatible with the existing house and the surrounding properties. However, it would be visible along Brimsdown Avenue and would not reflect the predominantly pitched and hipped roofs of

the nearby terraced properties. It would also contrast poorly with the roof form at the other end of the terrace. Additionally, the increase in the width of the property at roof level would result in No 78 appearing wider overall and the terrace appearing unbalanced. Furthermore, the proposed gable end would contrast negatively with the detached property's pitched roof and, as it is adjacent to a pitched and hipped roof on its other side, disrupt the rhythm of the roof slopes along the street.

7. The proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It conflicts with Policies DMD13 and DMD37 of the Council's Development Management Document, Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan, which seek high quality design and require roof extensions and other development to be in keeping with the character of individual properties, housing groups and surrounding context.

Other Matters

8. I have no reason to doubt that the proposal would improve the living accommodation for the occupiers of No 78A, or that the footprint of the detached property exceeds the footprint that No 78A would have following the development. Additionally, I note that the property is not subject to an article 4¹ direction, within a conservation area, a listed building or within the setting of heritage assets. Furthermore, neighbours did not object to the proposal. However, these matters do not address or outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR

¹ Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015