



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3291177

132 Chase Road, Southgate N14 4LE

- 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 Thamby Manmathan against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03598/HOU, dated 21 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single, part 2-storey side and rear extension with rear and side dormers with front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached house on the corner of Chase Road and Lakenheath. Being on the corner and due to the drop in land levels to the east down Lakenheath, the house is in a prominent position.
4. The house has previously been enlarged but these include single storey extensions which have minimal impact on the street scene. The proposal, however, would incorporate a two-storey side extension as well as alterations and enlargement of the roof. The cumulative impact of which would be significant.
5. I have considered the proposal in the light of the policies referred to in the decision notice, in particular, the National Planning Policy Framework¹, London Plan² Policy D4 and Core Strategy³ Policy 30 which all require development to be of a high quality of design. Development Management Document⁴ policies DMD 6, DMD 8 and DMD 37 also set out design standards. Policies DMD 11, DMD 13 and DMD 14 all specifically refer to extensions to dwellings.

¹ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

² Mayor of London – The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021.

³ Enfield Council The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025, Adopted November 2010.

⁴ Enfield Council – Improving Enfield Development Management Document (DMD), Adopted November 2014.

6. However, the overall bulk and design of the proposals would fail to reflect the original character of the house but rather would result in a mix of additions that would appear cumbersome and awkward. The location of the house on a corner means that it is particularly prominent and so the resulting property would appear unduly intrusive in the street scene. It would fail to meet the aims of these design-led policies.
7. I have considered the other examples of extensions cited by the appellant which have been approved either by the Council or on appeal. However, I have limited information about these which minimises the weight I can attribute to them. I also note the various extensions to other properties in the vicinity of the appeal site including the significantly altered dwelling on the opposite corner of Lakenheath. However, this also does not justify accepting the proposal.
8. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, it would conflict with the policies referred to and therefore, the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR