

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3336876

66 Raynham Avenue, Edmonton, London N18 2BS

- 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 Ilir Kume against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 23/03505/HOU, dated 15 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side/rear infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling has a hipped main roof and an outrigger to the rear which is set below the eaves. The outrigger has a very shallowly pitched roof which matches that of its neighbour. The lower level and scale of these outriggers ensures that they sit subserviently to the rear and do not compete with the overall form of the main parts of the dwellings that they serve. These twin features represent distinctive, uniform elements when visible within the street scene. Although the detailing of the outriggers has little architectural interest, it is their form, in relation to the main terrace, that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The infilling of the area between the flank wall and the outrigger would increase the scale and prominence of the side elevation when viewed from the street. The greater expanse of this unrelieved elevation, including the flat parapet to the roof, would detract from the existing form of the main roof and the proportions of the flank elevation. The side wall and parapet would be prominent and the lack of relief back from the pavement would detract from the character and appearance of the property when viewed from the side. When viewed from the rear, the subordinate nature of the outriggers would be lost as the new arrangement would dominate the rear elevation. This would reduce the design quality of the composition overall and would represent poor design.
-

5. There are a number of end properties in the vicinity that have had similar works completed. No details have been provided to suggest that these have been recent additions or considered against the current development plan policies. They do not make a positive contribution to the street scene and do not suggest that these works would be acceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to the design objectives of policy D4 of The London Plan 2021; policy CP30 of the Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010); and policies DMD6(a&c), DMD8(1b) and DMD11(1c) of the Development Management Document 2014. There would also be conflict with the element of the *National Planning Policy Framework* 2023 which seeks development that adds to the overall quality of the area.
6. The proposal would provide a first floor bathroom and improve the accommodation within the dwelling. It would also bring investment to the local economy. However, whilst there are matters that weigh in favour of allowing alterations to the property, they are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR