



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3322434

26 Greenwood Avenue, Enfield EN3 5DN

- 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 Mercy Nabirye against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04154/HOU, dated 13 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, dormer roof extension, internal remodelling and garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house with a flat roofed single storey rear extension, which projects beyond the flank wall of the original house. It is located in an area predominantly made up of similar, relatively small, terraced houses with good sized front gardens, the majority of which, including the appeal dwelling, accommodate space for car parking.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would be approximately 2.035 metres wide and approximately 6.114 metres deep. It would align with the front elevation of the existing house and would infill the space to the side of the original house, aligning with the flank wall of the existing single storey rear extension.
5. The existing space to the side of the appeal dwelling does not appear to reflect the tighter spacing between terraces evident elsewhere in the street and the proposed side extension would appear to reflect this spatial characteristic of the local area. The proposed side extension would also extend and maintain the hipped end roof form of the existing house.
6. A proposed dormer window extension, also with a hipped roof form, would be set centrally within the side hipped roof of the proposed side extension. This

- would provide space for a staircase access to additional living accommodation within the combined roof space of the existing house and the proposed side extension.
7. This proposed dormer window would face towards the side roof of the neighbouring end of terrace property at 28 Greenwood Avenue and would be set in slightly from the flank elevation and slightly down from the extended roof ridge of the main house. The setting in of the proposed dormer from the roof edges, ridge and eaves appears to be significantly less than the 0.5 to 0.75 metres that policy DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (the EDMD) sets out as being normally expected for such insets for roof extensions.
 8. The proposed side dormer would be approximately 2.346 metres wide, and when considered within the context of the limited insets identified above, appear as an overly large addition to the roof of the appeal dwelling. Due to its proposed size and position in the side roof of the proposed two storey side extension, the proposed dormer would appear as a dominating and incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part.
 9. The dominating and incongruous effect of the side dormer on the appeal dwelling would also result in the proposal, appearing as a discordant and unduly prominent addition to the roofscape of the terrace and that local area. This which would be readily apparent in extensive views along the street, where side dormers do not form part of the local roofscape. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the local streetscene.
 10. The appellant has drawn my attention to the existing degree of screening of views of the roof of the appeal dwelling provided by trees and planting to the front of the property. I find, however, that this would only provide very limited screening of the proposed dormer side extension and dormer and is not necessarily a permanent feature. I have therefore afforded this only limited weight in my considerations.
 11. The proposed garden room building would be located to the rear of the property and would appear to sit comfortably within the context of the rear garden and would not be a visually intrusive addition to the appeal dwelling when considered in isolation. Lack of harm in this context is a neutral factor in my considerations.
 12. For these reasons, I find that, when considered as a whole the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace within which it sits and that of the local area. This would conflict with policies DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the EDMD, policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek development, including extensions, that is high quality and design led, reinforce locally distinctive patterns of development, and has no negative impact on streetscene.
 13. Although the Council's decision notice concludes that the proposal would not accord with policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), I have not come to this same

conclusion, as this policy relates to design management procedures and policy guidance for London planning authorities.

14. The appellant has set out the benefit of the proposal in terms of providing improved accommodation for their family needs. This is however, a predominantly private benefit and no public benefit has been put before me that would outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

15. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR