



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by Matthew Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Thursday, 11 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3227312
Rhodanthe, The Vale, Southgate, N14 6HN

- 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 Nicholou Costas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00067/HOU, dated 7 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dormer bungalow located on a street mainly characterised by two-storey dwellings. The proposal is to build a two-storey side extension which would include a garage at ground floor level.
4. The two-storey height and excessive width of the proposed extension would represent a significant departure from the modest height and width of the existing bungalow. Furthermore, the front facing gable roof design and fenestration pattern would be at odds with the existing dwelling and the style of properties in the street. The overall scale, height and form of the extension would fail to harmonise with the existing dwelling and would appear as a visually discordant and disharmonious addition to the street.
5. I conclude that the development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area, failing to maintain or improve the quality of the built environment, contrary to the requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010. The development would also conflict with Policies DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document Development Plan Document 2014 which requires, amongst other matters, that high quality design is achieved by ensuring side extensions are subordinate to the original dwelling and not dominant on the street frontage.

Other Matters

6. I appreciate that the appellant considered alternative forms of extension but discounted them due to design concerns. However, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the scheme before me and find it unacceptable for the reasons stated.
7. Even though the appellant does not consider that the extension would affect the living conditions of occupiers of nearby properties, I am aware that local objections have been received. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not pursued this matter further.
8. I appreciate that the appellant feels that the Council have not responded to their requests for clarity in a cooperative manner. However, these are matters between the main parties and have had no bearing on my decision.

Conclusion

9. I therefore conclude that, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Matthew Woodward

INSPECTOR