



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3298180

1 Bexhill Road, Southgate, London N11 2RG

- 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 B Islam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
The application Ref 22/00084/HOU, dated 11 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side and rear extension at 1 Bexhill Road, Southgate, London N11 2RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00084/HOU, dated 11 January 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Ground Floor Plan: Drawing No.04; Proposed Roof Plan: Drawing No. 05; Proposed Elevations: Drawing No.06; proposed; Location Plan: Drawing No.08; and Existing Section: Drawing No.09.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the property itself.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area, characterised typically by terraced two-storey properties. Some properties in the area have been altered and/or extended in a variety of ways, notwithstanding this there is in general a uniformity retained. The appeal site is an end terraced two-storey property on the corner of Bexhill Road and Pevensey Avenue.

4. The side boundary enclosure at the appeal site is sited hard up to the footpath comprising timber and concrete posts adjacent the side elevation of the property and concrete panels extending the majority of the side garden with large metal gates towards the rear. The boundary is utilitarian within the streetscene, similar to others in the area.
5. Policy DMD14 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (the DMD) requires side extensions to maintain a distance from the back edge of the pavement on the return frontage to the flank wall. The policy does set out how this will be assessed taking into account building line and vista to properties, character of area, the dominance of the structure along the street frontage amongst other things.
6. The proposed side extension would be large projecting beyond the front of the two storey elevation of the property, linking with the projecting ground floor feature. Extending the length of the side elevation and projecting approximately 3.7m further than the rear elevation the proposed development would wrap around the property to the shared boundary with No. 3 Bexhill Road and extend beyond that of the neighbouring property's single storey extension.
7. The roof has been designed at a shallow pitch sloping up from the adjacent footpath in an attempt to reduce the visual appearance of the development.
8. I observed during my site visit that there are extensions hard up to the footpath on corner properties within the immediate area, namely No. 2 Bexhill Road and 2 Hastings Road. I also noted that the extension at 2 Bexhill Road, directly opposite the appeal site, projects beyond the two storey front and rear elevations wrapping around to the rear similar to the proposal before me. The extension at No. 2 is different in terms of design and appears smaller in terms of the rear projection, nonetheless this large extension is comparable.
9. Policy DMD11 of the DMD seeks to ensure that single storey extensions do not exceed 3m beyond the rear elevation of a terraced property and secure common alignment of rear extensions. The proposed development projects further from the rear elevation and beyond the extension to the neighbouring property No. 3 Bexhill Road.
10. Notwithstanding this, whilst the proposed extension would conflict to a degree with Policy DMD11 of the DMD the aim of the policy is to ensure that any residential extension does not disrupt the established pattern and form of development. From what I observed on site the proposed development would not appear out of keeping with the area or the property itself.
11. The proposed extension would be prominent on this corner plot, however the site is at a lower level to Pevensey Avenue and due to the single storey shallow roof design and the similarities to the extension at 2 Bexhill Road I find that the proposed development would not be incongruous in the streetscene.
12. The proposed development would extend the built form to the full width of the plot wrapping around the property nonetheless I find that it would be subordinate the existing property.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area nor the property itself. There is no conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), Policies DMD6,

DMD8, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of the DMD and Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seeks to create a strong sense of place, achieve good design appropriate to the local context.

Conclusion and Conditions

14. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development. I have included a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the property I have imposed a condition relating to the external materials.
15. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR