



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2023

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3321273

184 Turkey Street, Enfield EN1 4NW

- 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 Mevlit Hussein against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/04189/HOU, dated 11 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is partial front extension with first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. On this section of Turkey Street to the west of the A10 Great Cambridge Road, development is mixed, with residential uses to the northern side and the substantial buildings and grounds of St Ignatius College occupying the southern side, with the exception of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and the appeal dwelling standing next to the point where Turkey Street crosses New River and continues westward into the Green Belt where development is more sporadic. There is not a uniform character to the area, therefore.
4. The appeal dwelling stands significantly rearward of the semi-detached pair, to the extent that an existing deep, single storey, flat roofed front extension still sits well back of the front elevation of No 182. The proposal is for a first floor extension above this with an additional section added to the front of the ground floor element, above which would be a balcony accessed from large doors.
5. The existing front extension is an isolated example of such development within the streetscene, but the recessed position of the dwelling in its plot and its low, flat roofed profile reduce its prominence in the streetscene and allow the main body of the dwelling to be read, its pitched roof and materials reflecting those of neighbouring dwellings, which maintains a degree of continuity of design.
6. However, the proposal would create a significantly more substantial structure to the front that would physically dominate the dwelling, obscuring the whole of the original front elevation. The proposed flat roof would be a conspicuous feature that would change the overall complexion of the dwelling when viewed from the front, as the original pitched roof would be relegated to an occluded, secondary position to the rear. In these respects, the proposal would detract from the surviving continuity of design within the street.

7. The dominant scale and uncharacteristic form of the extension would also be clearly seen in views from the bridge crossing the river and points to the east due to the open aspect to the side of the dwelling. Awkward design elements such as the extension of the flat roof into the existing pitched roof above the eaves line would exacerbate its harmful appearance in views from this side.
8. Furthermore, the large wide patio doors at first floor level would sit above a smaller garage door and create an unbalanced appearance to the front elevation. The proposed balcony, with projecting brick walls to each side, would be another conspicuous and uncharacteristic element not seen to neighbouring dwellings which would add to what would be a cluttered front elevation lacking cohesion in its composition. Despite the recessed position of the dwelling, I saw that the front elevation would be seen on approach from the west and would create a conspicuous and strident feature within the street scene.
9. The appellant has provided imagery of nearby buildings, but with little supporting information. In any event, they appear to be quite different forms of development not comparable to the proposal, and thus are of limited weight, with my considerations based primarily on my own observations of the area.
10. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policies D3 of the London Plan (March 2021), Core Policy 30 of the Core Strategy (November 2010), and Policies DMD 8 and DMD 37 of the Development Management Document 2014 (the DMD), which require that new developments achieve high standards of design, have appropriate regard to their surroundings and improve the environment in terms of visual amenity; that proposals for extensions have regard to factors including siting, layout, height, materials, bulk and massing.
11. The Council further refers to the effect of the proposal on views from within the Green Belt. Although the site is not within Green Belt, Policy DMD 83 of the DMD requires that there is no increase in visual dominance and intrusiveness of the built form on the Green Belt; that there is a clear distinction between the Green Belt and urban area, and that views from the Greenbelt into urban areas and vice versa are maintained. Despite my conclusions above, the position of the extension would be such that it would not have a significant effect on the eastward vista towards the Green Belt. Neither would the extension significantly alter the overall scale and visual impact the surrounding urban area already has on the opposing vista from the adjoining Green Belt. As such, I find no conflict with Policy DMD 83, though this does not negate the harm identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out, the proposal would conflict with the development plan. Benefits arising in this case would either be limited in scale, such as any economic output from the construction of the extension, or primarily private in nature, namely the provision of additional living accommodation for the appellant. These are not material considerations sufficient to outweigh the identified development plan conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR