



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3348842

30 Minchenden Crescent, Enfield, London N14 7EL

- 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 Christian and Dipa Allard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application reference is 24/01205/HOU.
 - The development is the erection of a part single, part two-storey front/side, 1st floor rear extension with Juliette balcony and flat roof, 1st floor front pitched roof extension at roof at side, rooflight to existing rear extension, 4x new windows to side elevation at ground floor, enclosed air conditioning unit under the rear patio with steps down to the garden and all associated site works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The development sought is substantially complete. It appears to have been constructed broadly in accordance with the plans. I have assessed the appeal scheme on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with accommodation in the roof space on a residential street along which 2-storey dwellings predominate. From what I saw, several buildings in the local area include sizeable extensions that are visible from either the site or the road and these vary in scale, design and general appearance. There is, therefore, some variety to the existing built form within the street scene and the local area to which No 30 belongs.
5. The hipped end to the main roof of No 30 has been altered and a flat roof dormer has been placed onto the extended rear roof slope. There is also a ground floor rear projection that extends across almost the full width of the host building. A gable feature has also been introduced above the 2-storey front bay. The Council appears to raise no objection to these elements of the appeal scheme. From the submitted evidence, and considering the recent positive planning history of the property, I have no reason to reach a different

view on these individual matters. Other components of the appeal scheme such as the relocation of the external steps in the rear garden with retaining walls and enclosures on either side have no discernable effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area. In those circumstances, I shall follow the Council's approach and focus on the new first floor rear and front extensions and on the totality of the development.

6. At the back of the main house, a sizeable first floor extension has been introduced, which spans more than half the width of the main wall. When seen from the back garden of No 30, the scale and mass of the new addition causes it to dominate the rear façade, the bulk of which is accentuated by the visually strong horizontal lines of the flat roof. Because this part of the appeal scheme is visually 'read' along with a large dormer just above and a ground floor rear projection below, both of which include flat roofs, the visual effect of the development, taken as a whole, is to distort the shape and proportions, overwhelm the rear façade, and spoil the appearance of the host building.
7. At the front, there is also an uneasy transition between the first-floor side extension and the host building given that the part hipped, part flat roof to the new addition is noticeably lower than the main ridge line. As a result, part of the side to the rear dormer is readily evident from the road, just to one side of the site. From this public vantage point, the awkward juxtaposition of roof lines, with a hipped end and flat sections at different levels in proximity, draws the eye because it is unconvincing.
8. In reaching this view, I appreciate that the development has been refined in the light of the Council's concerns that were raised in relation to an earlier application that was also refused. I also accept that first floor rear extension is not visible from the road given its position at the back of the main house. Nevertheless, the upper part of the finished building would be visible from the back gardens of the adjacent properties, which also form part of the area's character as it is experienced and appreciated by others. From these locations, the rear elevation of the finished dwelling attracts attention because the extensions appear together as overly large box-like additions. This arrangement contrasts markedly with that of the dwelling attached to No 30, which has also been extended at the rear.
9. Several properties in the local area include large extensions including those to which the appellants have referred and provided photographs. While these cases include some features of the development sought, and all form part of the varied character of the local area, none were the same or very similar to the overall development before me. In some instances, I saw that individual properties within pairs no longer match each other due to external changes that have taken place. Nevertheless, it is a central planning principle that each development should be assessed on its own merits. Having done so, my own conclusion is that despite the use of appropriate materials, the changes sought are of a scale and design that the character of the host dwelling is unduly compromised and there is a significant adverse impact on the local area.
10. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the development causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy D4 of The London Plan, Core Policies 4 and 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025, and Policies DMD 6, DMD 8, DMD 11, DMD 13, DMD 14 and DMD 37 of the Council's

Development Management Document. Together, these policies promote high quality design and aim to ensure that new development is appropriate in scale and bulk, and in keeping with the character, form and setting of the area. The appeal scheme is also at odds with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which state that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall qualities of the area.

Other matters

11. In reaching this conclusion, I have carefully considered the appellants' personal statement. I acknowledge that the enlarged house will provide valuable additional accommodation and a comfortable place to live and work for the appellants, their family and for visitors to stay. I also understand that the works were completed primarily due to time and financial constraints. That planning permission is sought retrospectively in this instance does not weigh against the appellants' case. Neighbours have not objected. However, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from others, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR