



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3353529

2 Rylston Road, Southgate, Enfield N13 5NQ

- 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 Baseer Ahmad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref. is 24/02019/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a "single-storey front extension, part single-storey rear extension, first-floor side and rear extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, and whether there is sufficient information on which to assess the risk of flooding.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is situated on the western side of Rylston Road not far from its junction with The Fairway to its north. The area is an established mainly residential one. The site is a two storey end-of-terrace dwelling with a rear garden and a front parking forecourt. At the rear at roof level, a gable roof has been formed from a hip, and a rear dormer has been inserted. It spans much of the rear roof area. It has two windows and a flat roof. The ground floor has a single storey rear extension with a flat roof.
4. The proposed development includes a single storey front extension, a part single and part two storey rear extension, a first floor side extension and a roof extension at the side. The first floor side/rear extension would have a pitched roof, the apex of which would be lower than the main roof ridge. The ground floor rear single storey extension would square off area to the north of the existing ground floor shower room.
5. A terrace of houses on The Fairway is situated perpendicular to the appeal site. No.29 The Fairway is the end-of-terrace property on the western corner of The Fairway and Rylston Road. Each terraced house has a rear garden, some with outbuildings, and these gardens back onto a gated accessway which runs in an east/west direction to the north of the appeal site.

6. The surrounding area is made up primarily of similar terraces, a number of which have been extended including at end-of-terrace locations. There is variety in existing built form in the area where properties generally retain their original hipped roof design. Extensions generally are of a size that do not appear dominant to the original dwelling.
7. Whilst the proposed rear/side extension would step back from the rear of the existing extension below it, it would be a very wide and bulky structure with a pitched roof. It would be more than half the width of the original dwelling. Part of the pitched roof would have to accommodate the cheek and front corner of the dormer resulting in an awkward design which would appear cluttered and overdeveloped from the rear. Taking these two factors together, the result would be a form of development that is overly dominant and poorly designed. The proposal would not be sufficiently subservient and the character and appearance of the host dwelling would be harmed.
8. In coming to this view, I have borne in mind that the location of the appeal site at the end of the terrace and with residential rear gardens to its north benefits from a greater degree of visual and spatial openness than a typical mid-terrace plot. Nevertheless, what is proposed at the rear/side would harm the host dwelling and would be visible in private views from some other properties. There would also be some oblique views from the public realm of the first floor rear/side element and the gable end roof and so the additional bulk and mass of those extensions would not be concealed. I have concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, in addition to the dwelling itself.
9. On my site visit I noted the form, design and scale of extensions to dwellings in the vicinity of the site, however, I have assessed the appeal proposal on its own individual merits, as I am obliged to do, and I conclude that it would unduly harm the host dwelling and local area.
10. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. It would be contrary to policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 and policies DMD 8, DMD 11, DMD 13, DMD 14 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014).

Flood Risk

11. The site is at risk of fluvial and pluvial flooding in a 1 in 100 year (+17% climate change) event. The proposed development may impact both the extent to which the site is safe from flooding, and the extent to which it may increase flood risk elsewhere. No information to inform that assessment is before me and so flood risks posed by the development are unknown. Consequently, there is insufficient information on which to make a flood risk assessment and I cannot rule out that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm from flooding.
12. On this issue, I conclude that insufficient information in the form of a flood risk assessment has been provided to enable assessment of whether the proposed development would result in an increase in flood risk on or off site, and suitable flood control and mitigation measures have not been demonstrated. The

proposal is contrary to policies SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan 2021, policies DMD 59, DMD 60, DMD 61 and DMD 62 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014) and policy CP 28 of the Enfield Core Strategy (adopted 2010).

Conclusion

13. Having considered all representations made including the benefits to occupants flowing from additional living space and enhanced functionality and sustainability, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR