
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3230163

5-7 Greystoke Gardens, Enfield North, Enfield, EN2 7NU

- 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 Ms Lubna Usmani against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00256/HOU, dated 21 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the site address from the Council's Decision Notice rather than the application forms as it more accurately identifies the site.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. 5-7 Greystoke Gardens is a detached two storey dwelling which has an existing dormer on its side elevation. The proposed development is a first floor rear extension which would connect to the existing side dormer extension.
5. The proposed rear extension would extend across virtually the full width of the existing dwelling above an existing single storey element. It would also extend beyond the original rear profile of the dwelling to connect to the existing side dormer. The extension would have a depth of about 2.36m and an overall width of about 11.8m. There would be no increase to the footprint of the dwelling.
6. The proposed rear extension would appear as a highly dominant feature on the rear elevation by virtue of its size and scale, and in particular, due its width. The dominance of the extension would be particularly exacerbated by extending beyond the original roof profile to connect with the existing side dormer extension. Accordingly, it would not appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling and would visually dominate the rear elevation of the host property. Overall, the proposed extension would be out of keeping and

detrimental to the visual appearance of host property due to its design and excessive scale, bulk, width and depth.

7. Whilst the appeal site is well screened by trees and other planting and the proposed extension would not be particularly prominent from any adjoining dwellings, this nonetheless does not lessen my concerns regarding the overall impact of the extension of the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The proposed extension would result have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD11 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) which collectively require development to be of a high quality design and to respect existing character. Whilst the Council also refer to Policy 7.1 of the London Plan (2016) I have not been provided with a copy of this policy and therefore I have not taken it into account in the determination of this appeal.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's comments regarding Strategic Objective 4 of Enfield Council's Core Strategy and I appreciate the benefits to the appellant and her family in terms of improved living accommodation. However, this consideration is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

10. Accordingly, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR