
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2016

by D M Young BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/16/3155112
215A Southbury Road, Enfield EN1 1QY.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stelliana Mavroveli against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 15/05420/HOU, is dated 27 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension at 215A Southbury Road, Enfield EN1 1QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/05420/HOU, dated 27 November 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan drw no. 1, Elevations drw no. 2, Elevations and floor plans drw no. 3, Floor plans drw no. and floor plans drw no. 4a.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal is made against the failure of the Council to determine the application within the prescribed period. Following the submission of the appeal, the Council provided a statement outlining their concerns in relation to the proposal which confirmed that had it been in a position to do so, the application would have been refused due to the design of the extension and its effect on the street scene.

Main Issue

3. In light of the above, I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, end-terrace property located at the corner of Southbury and Percival Roads. The proposed second storey extension would be constructed above an existing diminutive flat-roof side extension.
-

5. The surrounding area is residential in nature and characterised by rows of terraces of varying length arranged along mainly straight, parallel streets. Although there is some variation in house design and facing materials, the area retains a broadly homogenous character with groups of buildings of similar scale and a generally common relationship with the street. Its distinctiveness as an area has however been compromised by both the widespread loss of front gardens and boundary treatments to accommodate paved parking areas and the prevalence of side and rear extensions which generally lack a coherent architectural approach. As a consequence, the area is not particularly notable or sensitive in architectural or streetscape terms.
6. The ridge line of the proposed extension would be set down slightly from that of the existing property. The fenestration in the front and rear elevations would largely replicate that of the ground floor. The side gable wall facing Percival Road would be blank. In my view, the development would improve the overall visual appearance of the host property which is currently unbalanced by the incongruous existing single storey extension. The Council's opposition to the scheme is based primarily on the lack of separation and the angle between the extension and the back edge of the footway along Percival Road. Whilst I accept there would be an inevitable increase to the bulk and mass of the property, the extension would be contained within the existing footprint of the single storey which itself is already visible from Percival Road above the existing fence.
7. Although the scheme would increase the mass of the side elevation, due to the alignment of Percival Road only a small section of the extension furthest from Southbury Road would actually abut the footway. As I saw on my site visit that there is a rear extension to 213 Southbury Road which abuts the adjacent footway. I also saw other examples in the area of two-storey blank gable walls built up to the side road highway boundary. Therefore and notwithstanding the provisions of Policy DMD 14 of the "*Development Management Document 2014*" (DMD) it is evident that similar side and rear extensions are inherent features of the area.
8. In this context and given the character of the wider area I have already set out above, I do not consider that the development would appear unduly cramped, dominant or cause unacceptable harm to the street scene or wider area. It would thereby accord with Policy CP30 of "*The Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010*", Policies DMD8, DMD14 and DMD37 of the DMD and Policies 7.4. and 7.6 of "*The London Plan*". Collectively these seek high quality development that has an appreciation of the character, context and setting of neighbouring buildings.
9. I have imposed conditions limiting the life of the planning permission and specifying the approved plans in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

D. M. Young

Inspector