



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3332812

9 St Elphege Road, Enfield, Edmonton N9 8BU

- 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 Ozgun Ahmet against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 23/02440/HOU, dated 25 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the Council's description of development as a 'two storey side extension' as that is a more accurate specification for the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a two-storey terraced dwelling with an attached garage to the side. The houses at this side of Elphege Road are similar in form and design with distinctive gabled bay windows. There is more recent brick built housing on the opposite side of the road. Overall, the density of development is high, with few gaps between the long terraces of older housing. In terms of other uses there is a vehicle service garage at the junction of St Elphege Road and Hertford Road.
5. The proposed side extension would include a relatively large replacement garage with accommodation above at first floor level and a hipped roof. The roof would be stepped down from that of the main dwelling and the side extension would also be set back from the existing front elevation of the building. However, the extension would appear bulky and out of character with the dwelling because of its width and large garage door.
6. The development would extend to the boundary of the appeal dwelling and that of 11 Elphege Road, effectively filling the majority of the gap between the

dwelling and creating the appearance of an excessively long terrace. This would be contrary to Enfield Development Management Document policy DMD14 which indicates that side extensions should not result in a continuous façade of properties or 'terracing' effect which is out of character with the locality. The appellant refers to the 1 metre separation distance between dwellings in the policy and that long terraces form a context. Despite this, the proposal would reduce one of the few gaps between the dwellings that form part of the character of the street scene and that provide an important visual break in this area of high built density.

7. I find that, although the proposed side extension would be constructed using matching materials, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area because of its scale, form, design, and resultant terracing effect. It would conflict with the Enfield Plan Core Strategy policy CP30, which seeks to ensure high quality design related to its context. It would fail to comply with Enfield Development Management Document policy DMD37 and London Plan policy D4 as it would not represent good design and would be inappropriate in its context. It would also conflict with objectives of good design in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. The design of the new front window and fenestration does not complement the existing fenestration. That matter could be resolved through the imposition of a condition requiring an amended drawing, as suggested by the appellant. However, that would not resolve the overall harm from the proposal to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. The appellant has referred to other extensions to dwellings in St Elphege Road. Nevertheless, their existence does not justify harmful development at the appeal site.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR