

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17th March 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3167429
14 Bankside, Enfield, Middlesex, EN2 8BN.

- 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 John Burgess against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 16/04052/HOU, dated 3 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is part single storey part 2 storey extension.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The description of the proposals cited in the header above (derived from the planning application forms) makes no reference to a rear dormer which was depicted on the submitted plans. The Council determined the application as including this element and I shall do likewise. The application also included alterations to the front elevation fenestration.
 2. The appellant submitted revised plans with the appeal (Drawing Nos: 01: Existing Floor Plans; 02 Rev A: Proposed Floor Plans; 03: Proposed Loft and Roof Plans; 04: Existing Elevations and 05: Proposed Elevations.). These delete the rear dormer, reduce the height of the two storey element and increase its depth. I appreciate these have been submitted to address the Councils' concerns. However, I have reservations about determining the appeal on the basis of them since the revised proportions of the two storey element, although slight, could cause prejudice to third parties and I cannot be sure they have had the opportunity to comment on them. I shall therefore determine the appeal on the basis of the plans originally submitted with the application, which included the rear dormer.
 3. The Council take issue with the adequacy of the plans in terms of the absence of a floor plan for the loft accommodation and the accuracy of the dormer as depicted on the plans. I have not been provided with any information as to why the absence of a loft plan is an issue and I cannot see any obvious error in the depiction of the proposed dormer. I therefore consider the plans submitted to the Council form an adequate basis on which I can determine the appeal.
-

Decision

4. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single storey part 2 storey extension and rear dormer, plus alterations to front elevation fenestration, at 14 Bankside, Enfield, Middlesex, EN2 8BN, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/04052/HOU, dated 3 September 2016, 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: Ordnance Survey Site Location Plan A4; Block Plan 1:500@A4; Drawing No: 01: Existing Floor Plans; Drawing No: 02: Proposed Floor Plans; Drawing No: 03: Existing and Proposed Elevations.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The Council take exception to the height of the two storey element and in particular, the fact it would have a ridge height the same as the existing projecting front gable. However, the fact it would be set back well behind the existing front elevation of the property, coupled with its limited projection out from the side, would ensure that it would nonetheless appear as a subordinate addition thereto. The Council refer to unbalancing the pair of properties (the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour). However, there is no particular symmetry between the pair of houses (the adjoining property being absent the projecting gable). This being the case, I cannot concur with that view.
7. I also viewed a similar extension to the side of a comparable property at the head of the adjacent cul-de-sac Hedge Hill, cited by the appellant. The Council point out that this was approved in 2001 and has a different plot size and relationship with its neighbour than the present appeal. It nonetheless illustrates to me that the proposal would not look at all out of place.
8. The proposed rear dormer would have a flat roof, but this is not an uncommon form of roof addition and occupying a discrete position on the rear elevation and seen against the backdrop of the much larger roofscape to the host property, I consider it would appear as an unremarkable addition thereto. Moreover, it would not be readily visible from the public domain and would only be seen at a distance from nearby properties.
9. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would integrate satisfactorily with the appearance of the host property and wider character and appearance of the area. I thus find no conflict with Policies 13, 14 and 37 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document (2014), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015) and the advice in the Framework, which seek to secure a high standard of design in new development, which is of the highest architectural quality, is in keeping with the character of the property,

not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area and otherwise has no adverse visual impact.

10. The appellant submitted several examples of other developments in the vicinity. The majority of these are not directly comparable with the appeal proposal as they concern development of a different nature (with the exception of the house on Hedge Hill cited above). They have not therefore influenced my decision.

Other Matters

11. The occupier of No 12 Bankside expressed concern about potential loss of light to first floor toilet and bathroom windows and ground floor French doors to the dining room. However, as the extension would be orientated to the North East of that property, set away from the common boundary thereto and offset slightly relative to it, any impact in this regard would be limited and insufficient to cause material harm.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement of development, the Council suggested conditions. A condition confining the approval to the submitted plans is necessary for clarity. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is superfluous, as the application forms indicated matching bricks and clay tiles and any material deviation therefrom would require further permission.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR