



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023 by Ms S Maur

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3319246

11 The Spinney, Enfield, Southgate N21 1LL

- 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 Matthew Burbidge against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 23/00031/HOU, dated 5 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side extension, 1m away from adjacent property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The Government published on 5 September 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The area around the appeal property is residential and is predominately characterised by two storey semi-detached pairs of 1930's style dwellings. The appeal property has been extended with a gabled roof and an attached single garage which is also attached to No 9. The other dwelling in this pair of properties has a hipped roof extension over its garage.

6. There are a variety of roof forms in the vicinity and examples of other side extensions of different designs. The proposal would have a low hipped roof set down from the main ridge, leaving a partial gable end but continuing the front roof slope across. This form and location would appear as an incongruous addition to the roofscape and sit uncomfortably with the existing roof. As a result, the proposal would be distinctly at odds with the more traditional roof designs of the host dwelling and the immediate surrounding area.
7. The visual impact of the proposal would be exacerbated by its prominent location opposite the junction with Laurel Drive. Although the existing roof form of the pair of properties is currently unbalanced, the proposed design of the roof would add to the lack of symmetry and would not help to balance the pair. Therefore, the proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the property and its context when viewed from the surrounding area, and would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would be a modest addition which would not extend beyond the rear wall of the property and would maintain a 1m distance from the neighbouring property. This would not result in significant bulk and mass and would prevent a terracing effect. This siting would also prevent harmful overshadowing, loss of light or loss of privacy to the neighbouring property as the extension would not have a significantly different impact to the existing dwelling in these respects. However, collectively, the lack of harm in these respects are neutral factors and would not mitigate against the harm identified.
9. The appellant refers to several other two storey side extensions in the area. Of those, some are balanced across pairs or adjacent properties while others continue the existing roof line, respecting the form and proportions of the dwelling. The extension at No 19 is less sympathetic to the original dwelling and therefore not a model to draw from. I have no information about how or when these came to be permitted, or the policy context at the time. They are not therefore demonstrably comparable to the scheme before me and do not justify the harm that would result from the appeal proposal.
10. Although the proposed extension is smaller than previously sought, I have considered it on its own merits, therefore this does not alter the conclusion I have reached. The appellant suggests that permission could be granted for a wider version if this would be more acceptable, however I can only consider the scheme before me. The appropriate method to test an alternative proposal would be through an application and, if necessary, a separate appeal.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) or Policies DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document (2014) and Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) which together seek high-quality design which has regard to local character and is appropriate in its context. Furthermore, there would be conflict with the Framework, which seeks to resist development that is of poor design and is not sympathetic to the local character.
12. The Council cites DMD Policy DMD14 in its reason for refusal, however given the set back from the side boundary I find no conflict with this Policy. This does not however outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and agree with the reasoning set out above and the conclusion reached. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR