



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3302792

126 Bramley Road, Southgate, London, N14 4HU

- 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 R Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/01337/HOU, dated 19 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side/front and rear extension and insulated external rendering.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted only insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and insulated external rendering at 126 Bramley Road, London, N14 4HU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/01337/HOU, dated 19 April 2022 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 plans insofar as they relate to the single storey rear extension and insulated external rendering only: JB/RS/P 001 Rev D JB/RS/P 002 Rev D JB/RS/P 003 Rev B JB/RS/P 004 Rev D JB/RS/P 005 Rev B.
2. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front extension.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies D4 in the London Plan (2021), CP30 in the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) and policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 in the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) which together, seek to encourage and deliver high quality design.
4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house which is located on a slip road parallel to a busy main road within a residential area. It is within a row of four pairs of inter-war built semis which were built to an attractive, symmetrical design of a main hipped roof with projecting hipped bays and a centrally positioned lean-to roof across the front doors in the recessed part of

the building. In each of the other pairs, there are front extensions which project forward of their adjoining neighbour, disrupting the symmetry of the pair and the rhythm of the street scene. In this case, the appeal dwelling has a small flat roofed porch extension but the pair retains the form of a continuous lean-to roof across both dwellings which contributes positively to the character of the pair and the surrounding area.

5. The proposed front extension would span the width of and fill in most of the recessed area of the property, having only a very slight set back from the main front projection. The new roof would have a shallower pitch than that of its neighbour. Although the removal of the flat roofed porch would be a small improvement, this would be outweighed by the insufficient set back and the shallower pitch of the new roof which would disrupt the continuity and symmetry of the existing arrangement.
6. The Council says that although some of the other extensions are larger, none of the other dwellings have had planning permission for front extensions and that they appear to have been built some time ago. As such, they do not set a precedent for this proposal.
7. Whilst the proposed rendering would also set the appeal dwelling apart from its neighbour, the Council has said that could be carried out as permitted development and it has not objected to it. The proposed front extension would, for the reasons given above, add further to the differences between the dwelling and its neighbour. This would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and would be contrary to the policies referred to earlier.
8. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed single storey rear extension (for which a Certificate of Lawful Development, ref 22/01338/CEA, has been granted as lawful) and insulated external rendering which as noted above, could be carried out as permitted development. In these circumstances, as it is clear that both of those parts of the proposal are separate elements from the front extension, I shall issue a split decision.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (insofar as it relates to the approved elements only), in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring that external materials will match those of the existing dwelling is not necessary because the application specifies external rendering which is acceptable for the reasons given above.

Conclusion

10. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal should be allowed, insofar as it relates to the rear extension and the insulated external rendering only.
11. However, the front extension would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the front extension.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector