



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 September 2021

by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3280249

105A Monmouth Road, Edmonton, London N9 0JD

- 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 I Kunduru against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/00907/HOU, dated 8 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a part single, part two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 105A, Monmouth Road, Edmonton, London N9 0JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00907/HOU, dated 10 March 2021, and the plan submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: A21-23-01a.
 - 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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Monmouth Road consists of two-storey semi-detached and terraced housing, which stands close to the highway. The area has a close-knit pattern of development with a shared front building line, similar height buildings with limited breaks in built form. An alleyway runs to the side of the plot connecting through to Cornwallis Road behind. The appeal site is half of a semi-detached pair of dwellings. As the property accords with the local pattern of development it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
4. The proposed side extension would occupy a currently open gap between the dwelling and an alleyway. The gap provides some sense of visual openness, but

this is of moderate gain to the streetscene of Monmouth Road, due to its limited width. Also, the gap as viewed from Cornwallis Road is largely enclosed by the rear elevations of No's 105 and 105A. As a result, this gap makes a negligible contribution to the surrounding streetscene.

5. Policy DMD 14, of the Council's Development Management Document (2014)(DMD), provides guidance on side extensions. Such development should be one metre from the boundary of an adjoining property to prevent the 'terracing effect'. As the plot adjoins an alleyway, rather than an adjoining property, it would not visually connect to the adjacent dwelling or contribute to a terracing effect. The side extension would include a complementary hipped roof. Also, this would be substantially narrower, lower and therefore subservient to the main dwelling. Consequently, the proposed side extension would not compete with the vertical emphasis of the host dwelling's projecting bay.
6. The proposed first-floor rear projection would have a limited impact on the appearance of the dwelling's rear elevation, and its setting with neighbouring development, mindful of its context close to several local similar examples. Furthermore, the proposed single-storey rear extension would satisfy the Council's guidelines. These elements are relatively insignificant, either separately or in combination, and would not result in disproportionate additions to the existing dwelling.
7. The appeal site currently accommodates two trees. These seem to be a semi-mature silver birch and a crown lifted fir tree. These are small and appear to be relatively low quality. Being set back into the rear garden they make a limited contribution to Monmouth Road, and only a slightly elevated significance in views from Cornwallis Road. There is also no evidence before me to illustrate they have significant biodiversity interest. As a result, the affected trees are of limited biodiversity value and their retention is not warranted.
8. Consequently, the proposed extension would complement the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would satisfy policies DMD 6, DMD 8, DMD 11, DMD 13, DMD 14, DMD 37 and DMD 80 of the DMD. Furthermore, the proposal would meet policies CP4, CP30 and CP36 of The Enfield Core Strategy (2010), policies D4 and G7 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies, among other matters, seek development to be of an appropriate scale and form and to retain trees where possible.
9. I have applied conditions, to set a timeframe for the commencement of development and to comply with the approved plan, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance. A condition requiring materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary in the interests of the area's character and appearance.
10. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted, subject to the attached conditions.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR