



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2023

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3324487
443 Baker Street, Enfield, EN1 3QY

- 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 Sian Dodunski against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref. 23/00724/HOU dated 6 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, No 443 Baker Street, (No 443) is an end of terrace dwelling arranged in a row of 6 terraced properties situate at the northern end of Baker Street. There is a pleasing sense of rhythm found amongst this row of terraces and those found on the adjacent road, Ridler Road. On my site visit I noted that there did not appear to be any two storey rear extensions to the outriggers to the rear of these properties. This leads to a sense of coherence in these properties which gives an attractive uniformity to the area.
4. The proposal, comprising of single and part two storey side and rear extensions, would be a sizeable addition to No 443 and would expand across the full width of the rear elevation at ground and first floor level. Whilst it would not be visible from Baker Street, the first floor rear extension would be visible from views obtained from the gardens of the adjacent row of terraced properties and from Ridler Road. The character of the row of terraces, and in particular the two storey rear outriggers, would be lost and the extension would appear as a discordant feature in the context of the immediate location. As such it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the row of terraces in which it is sited and to the wider area.
5. I appreciate that the appellant has sought to include design features within the proposed development which echo features found elsewhere. However on my site visit, I did not observe butterfly roofs to be a characteristic of roof slopes

generally in the area. Be that as it may, the inclusion of the butterfly roof would be awkward and unattractive as an addition to the existing structure. Further the two storey side/rear extension would unbalance the symmetry of the two storey rear outriggers on No 443 and the row of terraces in which it is situate. Whilst the gable wall and roof of the non- attached neighbouring property, is a dominant feature close to No 443, this in itself does not make the proposal acceptable in design terms. Moreover, No 443 is primarily viewed within the row of terraces in which it forms a part, rather than the adjacent non-attached property. As such, the existence of this gable wall does not justify development which would otherwise be unacceptable.

6. The Council has not raised any concern with regard to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and having regard to the juxtapositioning of the properties, I would agree with this assessment. However, the absence of harm in this respect does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
7. Accordingly the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Of the policies quoted to me by the Council it would appear Policies DMD 13 and 37 of The Enfield Development Management Document and Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy are of most relevance. Together these policies require development to be of high quality and design led having regard to their context and surroundings and to respect local character. The proposed scheme would also conflict with Policy D3 of the London Local Plan (2021) which requires the local context and architectural quality of an area to be respected. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure development sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above, the appeal is dismissed.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR