



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3232774

170A South Lodge Drive, Southgate N14 4XL

- 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 Peter Chrysafi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/01611/HOU, dated 1 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
 - The proposed development is part single storey extension, first floor extension over existing bungalow with dormer windows and a crown roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a bungalow with a pitched roof situated between the rear gardens of properties fronting South Lodge Drive to the south and Lonsdale Drive to the north. A bungalow of a similar scale, and in a similar position is sited approximately 50m to the east. The surrounding area is residential in nature and is primarily characterised by two-storey properties with hipped and half-hipped roofs.
 5. The proposed extensions would involve substantial increases in the height, width and scale of the dwelling. Indeed, the plans state the proposed additions would more than double the gross internal area of the appeal property from 146sqm to 383sqm. When combined, it is considered that these excessive additions to the host building would not represent subordinate additions. Furthermore, the proposed crown roof, two-storey rear gables and front dormer elements would not relate positively to the character and proportions of the host dwelling, nor reflect features found in the established character of the surrounding area. It is considered that the overall design and scale of the
-

resultant building would be an incongruous and obtrusive addition within the local pattern of development.

6. Though the appellant suggests the existing dwelling has little influence on the character of the area as a result of its unique backland position, it is not seen in isolation and development must still respond positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Indeed although front dormers are typical of chalet bungalows, they would be apparent within private views from the bungalow to the east and from properties fronting Lonsdale Drive to the north and would not adhere to the established character of the area.
7. The appellant asserts that the pitched roof of the proposed side extension over the existing garage would have a subservient appearance to the crown roof and would therefore comply with Part 2(c) of Policy DM14. However, Policy DM14 requires that side extensions must have a subordinate relationship to the original building. As the proposed crown roof is not an element of the original building, the proposed pitched roof element above the existing garage would not be subordinate to the original building and would therefore conflict with Policy DM14.
8. The appellant states that the proposal would result in the removal of the side-facing gable walls and would thereby reduce the negative visual impact to the character and appearance of the area. However, I consider the increased bulk and prominence of the resultant building would create a relatively greater level of harm in this regard.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause an unacceptable level of harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy (2010), and Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DM37 of the Development Management Document (2014), which generally seek to ensure that development is appropriate to the existing context and of an appropriate design, scale, bulk and massing. The proposal also conflicts with Policy DMD11 and DN14 which seek the same but with specific reference to rear and side extensions. The proposal would also conflict Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which respectively state that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area and should respond positively to the local context in terms of design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR