



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2022

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/21/3286122

Flat B and Flat C, 167 Hertford Road, Enfield EN3 5JG

- 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 Bilal Hassan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/03238/FUL, dated 22 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a double storey infill rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey infill rear extension at Flat B and Flat C, 167 Hertford Road, Enfield EN3 5JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03238/FUL, dated 22 August 2021, 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: BILAL-08-PL01 (Existing Floor Plans); BILAL-08-PL02 (Existing North Elevation); BILAL-08-PL03 (Existing South Elevation); BILAL-08-PL04 (Existing West 7 East Elevations); BILAL-08-PL05 (Proposed Floor Plans); BILAL-08-PL06 (Proposed East - North Elevations); BILAL-08-PL07 (Existing Block Plan); BILAL-08-PL08 (Proposed Block Plan); Site Location Plan (1:1250).
 - 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 effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two storey, flat roofed block containing two flats which stands to the rear of a short terrace on Hertford Road containing commercial units on the ground floor and residential units to the upper two floors. A vehicular entrance runs to the side of the block and behind it, providing parking and rear access for the commercial units. The ground floor units extend beyond the upper floors of the terrace, creating a wide flat roof at first floor level.
4. The existing block is L-shaped, with a cut-out to the rear corner that provides a small external space for the ground floor flat. It is utilitarian in its design, with unrelieved brick facades and no discernible fenestration pattern. The proposal

would infill the L-shape and square off the block. This would increase its overall massing, but not significantly so. In rearward views from the flats, the block would not appear substantially larger given the extension would stay within the existing side and rear building lines, and would add massing to the outer side of the structure, away from the flats. As the block already forms an isolated structure to the rear of the terrace, the enlargement from the infill extension would not demonstrably alter its overall scale or its relationship with the surrounding built form.

5. The proposal would continue the simple design of the existing block in red brick, which is characteristic of the surroundings. Views of the extension would be limited to the private space to the rear of the terrace and private views from the flats, from where the block would continue to form a large but relatively neutral building within a backland area characterised by commercial activity where function predominates over form. The extension would also be seen from the school playground to the rear of the appeal site, but from here the block would still retain a box shape and similar overall massing, and so would not have a significant effect on townscape views from this direction.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area. No conflict therefore arises with Policies CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD8, DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) or Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), which together require high quality development that takes account of the nature of the surrounding area and land use, and responds to its context through its layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape.

Other Matters

7. The application was not refused on the basis of the effect on neighbours' living conditions. Given the distance between the flats and the proposed extension, it would not have an overbearing or intrusive effect on neighbouring occupants, and would not lead to a material loss of light, outlook or privacy.
8. The proposal would result in the loss of the small external space serving the ground floor flat. However, I saw the space to be quite confined and its position adjacent to areas used for parking and commercial refuse storage lessens its value for occupants. Its loss would therefore have a limited adverse effect, but this would be offset by increased internal living space for both flats. I also note the flats are within easy walking distance of the public open space and amenities of Durants Park. Given this, I am satisfied that the proposal would maintain a suitable standard of accommodation for occupants of the flats.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate permission should nevertheless be withheld. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions specifying the relevant drawings, to provide certainty, and requiring external surface materials to match the existing building in order to secure a satisfactory appearance.

K Savage

INSPECTOR