
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3250556
79 The Fairway, London N14 4PB

- 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 Belgin Salimehmepou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00191/HOU, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 79 The Fairway, London N14 4PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00191/HOU, dated 28 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 2047-01b, 2047-02c, 2047-03e, 2047-04e and 2047-05c.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor rear extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of a two storey mid-terrace dwelling located on a relatively narrow spacious plot in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by two storey terraced properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway.
4. I observed on my site visit that a number of the nearby properties had single storey and dormer roof extensions projecting out from the rear of the buildings. The rear of the appeal property is dominated by a large single storey flat roofed extension projecting approximately 6.0m from the rear across the full width of the house and a large flat roofed dormer across the

rear roof plane. As a result, the original rhythm and harmony of the rear elevation of the terrace has been significantly eroded.

5. The appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property, including an appeal dismissed for a first floor rear extension in 2018¹. The proposed first floor rear extension would project out about 1.0m from the rear elevation and extend partially across the width of the house. It would be centrally placed within the rear elevation and stepped down below the main ridge of the house with a crowned tiled pitched roof. The proposal would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles at the rear of the host property and the surrounding properties.
6. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the first floor extension would not look significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The changes and reduction in the scale of the first floor extension would, in my view, address the concerns raised by the Inspector on the previous appeal scheme. The modest overall scale and proportions of the extension together with use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the development sits relatively unobtrusively against the built form of the host property.
7. The development would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. In addition, the development would not be visible from the road at the front and as such would not adversely impact on the street scene in the surrounding area.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the development would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 and Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development and extensions demonstrate a high quality design and that its scale and form is appropriate to the existing pattern of development and the local character. In addition, the proposal would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 124) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 127).
9. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.
10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR

¹ 17/03978/HOU and APP/Q5300/D/17/3188500