



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2024

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3342906

11 Hudson Way, London N9 0FU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mehmet Bektas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/00006/HOU.
 - The development proposed is creation of second floor addition.
-

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 appeal site is a modern, two-storey, end of terrace property located within modern estate of similar dwellings. They are generally set out in small terraces with the end dwellings having distinctive gable end front elevations. The majority of the terraces are two-storey although there are a number of end terraced properties which lie in corner locations or adjacent to a road that are of three-storey height, again with the gable end to front and rear.
4. The appeal site is an end terraced property, one of three terraces that front this part of Hudson Way. The terrace to the south of the appeal site is set back further from the road frontage such that much of the side elevation of the dwelling on the appeal site is visible within the street scene. The dwelling has a front gable elevation which projects forward of the main part of the dwelling with a similar front gable to the dwelling at the other end of the terrace providing a symmetrical appearance to the front elevation of the terrace. These are set slightly forward of the front elevation of the central properties with lower ridge height compared to the main terrace.
5. The proposal would extend the existing front gable upwards to create a second floor at roof level. It would have a pitched roof with single central ridge line running from front to rear considerably higher than the existing ridge line of the terrace. Although the front gable would reflect the design and appearance of those on the existing terrace, by reason of the additional bulk that would be introduced at and above roof level it would appear as an incongruous and unduly prominent addition. In addition, it would unbalance the existing symmetry of the terrace of which it is a part. The forward siting of the terrace within the street scene would mean that it would be particularly noticeable thus emphasising its inappropriate bulk and height.

6. As noted above, there are similar three storey properties within the wider street scene but these relate to end terraced properties that lie in corner locations such that there is a degree of space around the building commensurate with its additional height and bulk. They provide focal points within the wider estate as part of its original design and layout. Conversely, the appeal site occupies a central position within a row of two storey terraces and within which the proposal would appear unduly prominent and incongruous. As such, their context and position within the street scene is not comparable.
7. I find that the proposed second floor addition would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policies D4 and D8 of The London Plan (2021) which seek development in the public realm that is high quality, design-led and which has special regard to its context and not inappropriate within it. They also require that extensions have no adverse visual impact, that roof extensions are of appropriate size and location, in keeping with the character of the property, not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area and which do not disrupt the character or balance of the property or group of properties of which it forms a part.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR