
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

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

Decision date: 8 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3167628

Flat D, 392 Bowes Road, Southgate N11 1BJ

- 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 Jacovos Chimonas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/04236/FUL, dated 16 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side and rear extension at Flat D, 392 Bowes Road, Southgate N11 1BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/04236/FUL, dated 16 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:
 - Site Plan Drawing No 01 Rev A1
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing No 07 Rev A4
 - Proposed First Floor Plan Drawing No 08 Rev A3
 - Proposed Roof Plan Drawing No 09 Rev A3
 - Proposed Front and Side Elevations Drawing No 10 Rev A5
 - Proposed Rear Elevation Drawing No 11 Rev A3
 - 3) No development shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given in the application form is: "Single storey side extension to increase flat D's size. The proposed first floor extension to be above the ground floor side extension's planning approval ref. 2016/02093/FUL dated 8 August 2016." I have taken the description of development, as set out
-

in the heading above, from the Council's decision notice as this is accurate but more succinct.

3. Planning permission has been granted¹ for a single story side extension to provide additional accommodation to the existing ground floor flat (Flat B) at the appeal property. I have taken the permission into account in my consideration of this appeal.
4. The appellant has submitted an additional plan with the appeal documentation, proposed front and side elevations, drawing no 10 Rev A5. The appellant explains that the plan was submitted to rectify a minor drafting error and it is not a change to the scheme that was considered by the Council. The Council has not raised any objections to the submission of the amended plan. Consequently, I have accepted the plan, which correctly shows the proposed front elevation, as I am satisfied that this would not be prejudicial to the interests of the Council and other interested parties.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property comprises an end of terrace house which has been sub-divided into four flats. The proposed development would be built over a ground floor side and rear extension that has planning permission, but is yet to be built.
7. The approved ground floor extension would extend to the side boundary and would be wedge-shaped due to irregular shape of the plot. The proposed first floor extension would reflect the shape of the ground floor, although it would be set back from the side boundary and would not project as far to the rear.
8. Policy DMD 14 of the Development Plan Document² seeks to ensure side extensions have regard to the character of the local area. In particular, the policy aims to maintain established building lines and ensure development is subordinate to the original dwelling.
9. Although the property is on a corner plot, there is no definite building line along the flank road, Ravenscraig Road, due to the curve of that road and the siting of the existing property. Also, the appeal site is clearly distinct from the houses along the flank road as it is separated by Cranbrook Road, which runs along the rear of the site. Consequently, established building lines would be maintained.
10. The Council is concerned that an inadequate separation distance would be retained between the extension and the adjoining road, and this would result in an incongruous and intrusive feature which would be exacerbated by the design. Views of the development from Bowes Road would be restricted due to the existing house which is angled away from the road. I accept that the first floor extension would be more prominent in views from Ravenscraig and Cranbrook Roads. However, it would be viewed in the context of the approved ground floor extension, but would be smaller and set back from the side boundary. As such, it would appear subordinate to the original dwelling.

¹ Ref 16/02093/FUL dated 8 August 2016

² Enfield Council Development Management Document (DMD) adopted November 2014

11. Although the development would extend towards the roads at the side and rear, and its shape would be unusual, it would not appear incongruous or visually intrusive as its scale and design would be proportionate to that already approved. Overall, I find that the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street scene would not be materially greater than the approved ground floor extension.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition requiring samples of materials to be approved in order to ensure the extension complements the existing building.

Conclusion

13. To conclude, I find that the development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the street scene or the host building. Consequently, it would accord with Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy,³ which seeks to maintain and improve the quality of the built environment, and Policies DMD6, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document which, in combination, seek to ensure the scale and form of development is appropriate to the existing pattern of development.
14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector

³ Enfield Council Local Development Framework: 'The Enfield Plan' Core Strategy 2010-2025 adopted November 2010