



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2023

by J N Seymour BA (hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3314996

7 Ravens Close, Enfield, EN1 3UR

- 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 Leonard Roddhe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 22/03251/HOU, dated 20 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2022.
 - The development is described as 'First floor rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development taken from the application form reads as follows: "*Single partially first floor extension*". However, I have used the description of development displayed on the Council's decision notice as it is more succinct.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a residential dwelling forming the end of a terrace of four dwellings. The appeal proposal consists of a first floor rear extension which would be constructed over an existing single storey flat roof extension.
5. Numbers 3, 5 and 7 Ravens Close have had flat roof dormer windows constructed on their rear roof slopes. As these properties are adjoining each other and the dormers cover the full width of each rear roof slope, they appear as a single continuous roof structure, which, together with the lack of first floor rear extensions, has given the rear elevation of the terrace a common alignment and uniform appearance at first floor and above.
6. The appeal proposal would result in a protrusion beyond the common alignment creating a bulky, obtrusive addition that would materially harm the unity of the rear of the terrace at first floor level. As a result, this would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area where first floor additions are not common.

7. The appellant has highlighted to me an extension permitted nearby¹ that they believe to be similar to the appeal proposal as a justification for the appeal to be allowed. However, having assessed the plans provided to me by the appellant, it is clear the two cases are not comparable as the properties differ in size and the character of the streets on which they are located is also different. In any event, each case must be assessed on its own individual merits, which is what I have done in making this decision.
8. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DMD6 and DMD 37 of the Development Management Document 2014 (the DMD). Together these require that development is of high-quality design that has appropriate regard to its context. In addition, I note that Policy DMD11 states that first floor extensions must, where appropriate, secure a common alignment of rear extensions, which would not be the case here given the lack of other first floor extensions.
9. The Council also refers to Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy 2010 and Policy D1 of the London Plan in its reason for refusal. However, I have found them not to be determinative for this householder appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J N Seymour

INSPECTOR

¹ 21/02602/HOU