The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13th April 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3168934
211 Bury Street, Edmonton, London, N9 9JG.

- 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 G Vavvaros against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application Ref: 16/04779/HOU, dated 20 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2016.
- The development proposed is single storey side/rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi detached property standing at the junction of Bury Street with Lawn Close. The proposal comprises a single storey side extension projecting beyond the rear elevation of the property by 3 metres. It would feature a wide bay window to the front elevation to match that on the existing property and a flat roof with dummy hip around its perimeter.

4. Although single storey, the excessive depth of the extension projecting well beyond the rear elevation of the property, coupled with its width and height, would impart an unwieldy and discordant appearance. The rearwards projection, flat crown roof and the fact that the extension would stand very close to the pavement, would render it an obtrusive addition to the property, with a crude bolted on appearance. The effect would be exacerbated as it occupies a prominent corner plot in a slightly elevated position relative to Bury Street and with the side and rear clearly visible from Lawn Close.

5. The fact the extension would virtually abut the side boundary to the property would run counter to Policy DMD 14 of Enfield's Development Management Document (2014) (DMD), which stresses the importance of maintaining a separation from the pavement, particularly on corner properties such as this.

6. I take the appellant's point that there are other examples of single storey side extensions nearby, including those at Nos 209A and 235 Bury Street. However, the former is narrower and lacks the rearwards projection and the latter, whilst extending to the back edge of the pavement, features a mono-pitched roof over the majority of the extension. The Council also say that this particular extension was approved prior to the adoption of Policy DMD 14. I therefore do not consider that these examples are directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which I must in any event, determine on its individual merits.

7. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the host property and wider character and appearance of the area in which it sits. It would thus conflict with Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) and Policies DMD 14 and DMD 37 of the DMD, which seek to secure high quality design led development which is appropriate to its context and in the case of residential side extensions, maintain a distance from the back edge of the footpath, having regard to their bulk and dominance.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR