



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 October 2020

by E Brownless BA (Hons) Solicitor (non-practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3247438

142 Theobalds Park Road, Enfield, EN2 9DH

- 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 Gary Runagall against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref:19/03829/HOU, dated 7 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear/side extension at 142 Theobalds Park Road, Enfield, EN2 9DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref:19/03829/HOU, dated 7 November 2019, 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 following approved plans: 142TPR 1; 142TPR 2; 142TPR 3; 142TPR 4; 142TPR 5; 142TPR 6; 142TPR 7; 142TPR 8; 142TPR 9; 142TPR 10; 142TPR 11; 142TPR 12; 142TPR 13; 142TPR 14; 142TPR/1253 Proposed plans of sections first floor; Block Plan.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the development from the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a detached two-storey property located within a ribbon pattern of development fronting Theobalds Park Road. The area is generally characterised by a mix of one and two storey dwellings of varying styles and materials. Many of these have been extended, including a number at first floor

level. Dwellings generally follow a broadly similar build line to their front elevations and are set back from the road with sizeable front gardens.

5. The proposed extension would broadly fit the footprint of the existing single storey rear extension. It would align with the rear build line of the neighbouring two-storey dwelling. Albeit it would extend beyond the side elevation of the host dwelling, it would be set back some distance from the front elevation and therefore it would appear subservient to the appeal dwelling.
6. To the opposite side, the appeal dwelling is flanked by No 144, a bungalow consisting of a steep roof profile with high ridge line. Taken together with the existence of mature vegetation within the garden curtilage of No 144 and the appeal site, public views from the highway are partially obscured. Moreover, the use of matching materials and a similar pitched roof profile and ridge height to that of the host dwelling would aid in assimilating the proposed extension with the appeal dwelling. As a result, the proposal would not appear as an unduly bulky or dominant addition to the host dwelling.
7. By reason of the presence of other substantial sized dwellings nearby, in particular, No 140, which is of itself a substantial sized dwelling, I find that the proposal would not appear out of keeping nor detract from the prevailing pattern and character of development.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not be out of scale, overly dominant or out of keeping with the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, the proposed scheme would accord with Policies 7.1 and 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) insofar as these policies seek to ensure a high quality development that is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

Conditions

9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary in the interests of clarity to define the plans which the scheme should accord to. A condition specifying external materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

E Brownless

INSPECTOR