



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3256659

170A South Lodge Drive, LONDON, 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 London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01366/HOU, dated 4 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is "Part single, part 2-storey side/rear extensions to create an additional floor, involving front and rear dormers with side rooflights, together with conversion of garage into habitable room".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for Part single, part 2-storey side/rear extensions to create an additional floor, involving front and rear dormers with side rooflights, together with conversion of garage into habitable room. at 170A South Lodge Drive, LONDON, N14 4XL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01366/HOU, dated 4 May 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 following approved plans: A101, A104-A, A105-A, A106-A, A107-A and A108-A.
 - 3) That 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 proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large, gable-roofed detached bungalow itself set in a large plot to the rear of South Lodge Drive, with substantial screening to the garden, accessed via a private drive which also serves another bungalow and a number of garages. As such, the property is not readily visible from the public domain. The 2-storey semi-detached housing which surrounds the site and typifies the wider area, has a regular rhythm and form to its frontage, with predominantly hipped-roofs. Such properties have been variously altered and extended, giving a much less consistent character and appearance to the rear

and when viewed in the context of the appeal site. As such, I do not consider that the existing property directly relates to the character and appearance of the area around it.

4. As a result, although the proposal would significantly alter the character and appearance of the host property, I do not consider that it would be overly dominant, disproportionate or so intrusive as to cause harm to the character and appearance of the site or the area as a whole. The increase in the ridge-height of the property is relatively minor, and whilst the alterations to the roof do increase the bulk of the building, given the existing character, appearance and context, I do not consider this to be harmful or otherwise unacceptable.
5. In its report, the Council has quoted from a previous appeal decision on this site, but from the limited information provided the two proposals appear to be substantially different. As a result, the quoted comments of the Inspector in that case do not lead me to alter my own conclusions. I do not disagree that the proposal would be visible from surrounding properties, but the appeal site is already markedly different to the 2-storey dwellings which surround it. As such, I do not find a proposal which alters but maintains the difference between the site and its neighbours to be harmful or unacceptable.
6. I note the objections of third parties, in particular those concerning overlooking, access, loss of light and loss of privacy. However, the Council found the proposal acceptable in these regards, and having had regard to the separation distances, boundary screening and relationship between the site and its surroundings, I agree with that assessment.
7. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2015, adopted November 2010, and Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of Enfield's Development Management Document adopted November 2014. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development maintains the character and appearance of an area, is of high quality, contextually appropriate design and does not cause any adverse harm to the amenity of the area or occupiers of surrounding properties.

Conditions

8. Although the Council has indicated on their Questionnaire that they do not regard any conditions as necessary, I have imposed conditions requiring compliance with the approved plans and the use of matching materials. I consider that these are necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR