



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: 13th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3331637

75 The Fairway, Enfield, Southgate N14 4PB

- 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 Paul Constantine against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 23/02438/HOU, dated 26 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a small first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit a single storey rear extension and hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer were under construction. The proposal is for a centrally positioned, flat-roofed rear extension at first floor level above the new single storey rear extension.

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. No.75 The Fairway is a two storey semi-detached house located in an area with dwellings of similar age and design. The proposed first floor rear extension would be around 3.66 metres in width and would project from the rear elevation of the appeal building by around 2.38 metres.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal at 79 The Fairway in which a first floor rear extension was allowed on appeal in October 2020 (Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3250556). However, that development was of a smaller scale and different design compared to the appeal proposal before me. The Inspector's decision letter indicates that it would only project for around one metre from the rear elevation of 79 The Fairway and would have a crown tiled pitched roof. It is apparent from the decision that an appeal had been dismissed for a previous proposal in 2018. The Inspector in the October 2020 decision indicated that the changes and reduction in scale of the first floor extension would, in his view, address the concerns raised by the Inspector on the previous appeal scheme. He added that the modest overall scale and

proportions of the extension together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure that the development sits relatively unobtrusively against the built form of the host property.

6. In view of the differences in design and scale between the first floor extension at 79 The Fairway, and that proposed at 75, I consider that it forms insufficient precedence to allow the appeal before me. The proposed flat roof of the extension would match the horizontal form of the roof of the ground floor rear extension and dormer, but its width and amount of projection from the rear elevation of the dwelling would make it appear overly bulky and incongruous.
7. I find that an extension of the size and scale proposed would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. It would therefore 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 policies DMD11 and 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 the objectives of good design in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. 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