
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2017

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3179525
18 Garnault Road, Enfield, EN1 4TR

- 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 and Mrs Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/01650/HOU, dated 7 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace Victorian dwelling, which is situated in a residential area. It is positioned in a visually prominent position on the corner of Garnault Road and St George's Road. The surrounding area contains a mixture of house styles and ages, including terraced housing, detached and semi-detached dwellings, flats and bungalows. A number of properties have been altered and extended, including the dwelling on the opposite corner. This property has a single storey side extension that has been built close to the side boundary of the plot. However, I am not persuaded that this or other extensions in the locality create a precedent for this appeal proposal, which I am required to consider on its merits.
4. The proposal is to construct a single storey side extension, which would be attached to an existing single storey rear extension. The front wall of the proposed extension would be built in line with the original rear wall of the dwelling and it would be set in from the splayed side boundary of the site by approximately 1.5m–3.0m. The extension would have a hipped-roof with a flat central section.
5. The Council contends that the proposal would be out of keeping with both the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, the Council states that the development would conflict with Policy CP30 of its Core Strategy; and with Policies DMD 14 and DMD 37 of the Council's adopted Development Management Document. These policies generally seek to ensure that new

development is of high quality design and that it has regard to the character of the area in which it is located. In addition, Policy DMD 14 provides criteria against which side extensions should be assessed. These criteria include maintaining a distance between the back edge of the pavement and the flank wall of the proposed extension, and to have regard to the bulk and dominance of the structure along the street frontage. In my opinion, the Council's policies are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which has similar requirements (paragraphs 17 and 58).

6. In reaching my decision, I have given consideration to the fact that the proposed extension would be set well back from the front wall of the existing dwelling and that it would be approximately half the depth of the original building. I also acknowledge that there would be separation between the side wall of the extension and the pavement along St George's Road. However, the extension would still be a visually prominent addition to the property. In my opinion, it would appear incongruous in the streetscene and it would be at odds with the existing character and appearance of the dwelling because of its width, in comparison to the original dwelling; the lack of architectural detailing in its design; its relatively small windows; and the proposed hipped roof, which does not reflect the roof style of the original building.
7. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal would conflict with the adopted policies of the Development Plan and with the Framework, as referred to above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR