
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2017

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 02 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3165796
60 Greenway, Southgate N14 6NS

- 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 & Mrs Harvey & Natalie Lee against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/04136/HOU, dated 9 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "resubmission of application number 16/01822/HOU – garage conversion extension to garage and part glazed link from garage into playroom."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for garage conversion to playroom, extension to garage and part glazed link from garage into rear of the dwelling at 60 Greenway, Southgate N14 6NS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04136/HOU, dated 9 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Site Plan, 639-SU-005 and 639-BR-200 Rev A.

Procedural matters

2. The description of development given on the application form refers to a previous application at the property. As this does not constitute a description of development, I have removed that reference from the description in my formal decision above, although I have taken the previous application into account insofar as it is relevant to the development in front of me.
 3. The description suggests that the proposal would include a link from the garage to the playroom. However, the proposal would involve the extension and conversion of the garage into a playroom, with a link from the resulting playroom to the rear of the existing dwelling. I have amended the description in my formal decision as that more accurately describes the proposal.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed garage extension to be converted into a playroom and link from the new playroom to the existing dwelling on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Greenway is a residential street comprising semi-detached properties, most of which have shared accesses to the side and detached garages to the rear. No. 60 has been extended to the rear, as have a number of other properties, with a deep single storey and flat roofed extension. There is a short gap between this and the garage behind.
6. The proposal would extend the garage building to the front, in order to bring it closer to the rear of the property and closer to the front building line of the deeper outbuilding behind the neighbouring property; convert the garage into a playroom; and provide a short link between it and the house. The proposal would result in a single storey extension of substantial depth that would be viewed in glimpsed views through the shared access to the side of the property. It would extend built form to the rear of the house, which would be relieved only by a door through the link. However, the limited views from the street combined with the limited height of this single storey extension with flat roof ensure that the effect is minimal.
7. Policy DMD11 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) states that single storey extensions should not exceed 3 metres in depth on semi-detached dwellings and 3 metres in height. The proposal would meet the height limitation, but the existing extension to the property is already approximately 6m in depth. Given that, the additional depth would have limited effect on the character and appearance of the area beyond the existing extension.
8. My attention was drawn to 47 Greenway that has a very similar style of extension with converted garage and link between that and the rear extension to the house that I understand has a depth of around 10m from the original rear wall of the property and is located on the opposite side of the street. Whilst I understand that it was not as deep as that proposed, given that the original garage was closer to the rear of the house, both that and the current proposal would extend ground floor development across the width of the respective plots, infilling between the rear of the original house and garage behind. So whilst the appeal proposal would be deeper, this would not be noticeable from the street such that they would have the same effect on the character and appearance of the area.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension and conversion of the garage into a playroom, combined with a link to the rear of the house, would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, the proposed development would not conflict with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy and Policies DMD11 and DMD37 of the DMD that seek to encourage high quality design that make a positive contribution to the character of the area, including that there should be no adverse visual impact.
10. I note reference to another appeal decision (reference APP/Q5300/D/16/3146330) that related to an extension to the rear of a

terraced property to link to a detached garage. I have been supplied with very limited details of that extension to be able to fully understand how it compares to the present scheme and it is located in a different area, but I have seen the similar development opposite the site at 47 Greenway and I need to deal with the current proposal on its individual merits.

Conditions

11. A condition is necessary for materials to match those used on the existing house to maintain the character and appearance of the area. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

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

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR