



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3248178

40 Bush Hill Road, Southgate, N21 2DT

- 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 Ozkan Irdem against the decision of London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03772/HOU, dated 1 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part 2-storey side extension, together with conversion of garage into habitable room involving alterations to front elevation and new windows to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part 2-storey side extension, together with conversion of garage into habitable room involving alterations to front elevation and new windows to side elevation at 40 Bush Hill Road, Southgate, N21 2DT, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/03772/HOU, dated 1 November 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 00, 01, 02, 03, 04B, 05B, 07B1, 08B1, 09B, 10B1, 11B & 12B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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.

Procedural Matter

3. In the interest of accuracy, the description of development used in the header is taken from the decision notice and the appeal form, and this is not disputed by the appellant.
4. A set of amended plans were submitted by the appellant within Appendix 3 of the appeal statement. These show an amended roof form to the proposed side

extension. Drawing nos. 10B1 (Proposed Flank Elevation Left), 08B1 (Proposed Front Elevation) and 07B1 (Proposed Roof Plan) indicate the two-storey side extension would feature a fully hipped side roof thus removing the flat-roofed element of the proposal. The Council has highlighted that the revised plans show a larger roof, that there were objections to the development and that it therefore follows that it is possibility that neighbouring occupiers may continue to object to the revised plans. Although the revised plans have not been subject to public consultation I do not consider any parties would be prejudiced by the acceptance of these amendments in light of the modest scale of the changes. Also, the objections related largely to the proposed rear extensions which were removed from the original application and do not feature in this appeal. The objection regarding the proposal being out of character with the surrounding area is addressed below. A such I have accepted the amended plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, end-of-terrace property located on the corner of Bush Hill Road and Cranwich Avenue within an established residential area. The dwelling features a unique and original double-storey pitched roof side extension with an integral garage. The surrounding area is mixed in character but is mostly typified by small blocks of terraced dwellings with bay windows. Opposite the site, however, lies a grouping of bungalows. The proposed works would be on the flank of the building bordering Cranwich Avenue.
7. Whilst the Council is concerned with the height and width of the extension, I find that the resulting dwelling would be adequately proportioned due the limited width, subservient height and hipped roof of the extension. Indeed, I find the amended roof form would satisfactorily tie-in with the existing dwelling and more closely reflect the character and appearance of the existing roof profile. Indeed, the Council have stated the amendment to the roof shape responds to one of the issues with the refused proposal; the incongruous roof shape.
8. The plans also show that the front elevation of the first-floor element of the proposal would be slightly set-in from the principal front façade of the host dwelling which would serve to further accentuate its subservience. Although the Council expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the rhythm and harmony of the terrace, I do not find the extension would constitute a bulky mass despite the fact that it would widen the appearance of the front elevation. The subservience of the proposed side extension would be easily discernible given the front inset, the roof form, and the lower height of the extension compared to the main dwelling. In light of this, the proposal would not appear prominently within the street scene or disrupt the rhythm of the terrace and would be read as an adequately proportioned addition to the building.
9. With regards to the visibility splay of Bush Hill Road and Cranwich Avenue, I am not convinced the proposal would have an adverse impact on highway

safety given its set back from Bush Hill Road, and this issue was not raised by the Highways & Transportation officer.

10. Given the above, the proposed development would not conflict with Policies CP4 and CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy, Policies DMD8, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Local Plan document, and London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 which together seek to ensure proposals and residential extensions are well designed, relate to the original host building and the character of the area.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
12. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR