
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3242288

83 Kingsfield Drive, Enfield EN3 6UB

- 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 Cem Alkan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/03353/HOU, dated 30 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension with internal alteration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals 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 in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a dense residential area characterised by largely unaltered semi-detached or terraced properties with large gaps between the groups of dwellings. The proposal includes a part two-storey, part single storey side and rear extension, which would follow the irregular shape of the site, and a first-floor rear extension over part of the existing single storey rear projection.
5. The proposed two-storey section of side extension would be highly visible within the streetscene. Although there are other examples of side and rear extensions within the surrounding area, including at No 85 next door, the cumulative scale of the entire proposal would result in a disproportionately large addition which would not be in keeping with, or subordinate to, the host dwelling. It would appear incongruous in the context of the other more visually regular dwellings in the street scene. Although the proposal would result in the removal of the existing conservatory, the proposed extensions would result in a dwelling which is significantly larger than the existing and surrounding

properties, including both neighbouring properties at No.81 and No.85 which I recognise have both been extended.

6. Furthermore, Policy DMD14 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) states that a minimum distance of 1 metre from the boundary with adjoining properties should be maintained. As agreed by both parties, the proposed single storey side extension would be 0.9 metres from the boundary with the boundary of neighbouring property, and therefore would not be in accordance with this policy.
7. The appellant has stated that the design of the first-floor rear extension has been approved in other London Boroughs as well as in the London Borough of Enfield. However, each proposal is considered on its individual merits and the cumulative impact of the entire proposed development has been found to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area and would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) which collectively seek to ensure high quality design which respects the character of the area and has no adverse visual impacts in relation to residential extensions including rear and side extensions.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has suggested that the proposed first-floor rear extension would be in accordance with the 30-degree rule, which prevents loss of daylight to the windows of neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harm found to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR