



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3339736

98 Tenniswood Road, Enfield EN1 3HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Eser Mustu against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03389/HOU.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor rear addition at 98 Tenniswood Road, Enfield EN1 3HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/03389/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: G-E-01 Rev C, G-E-02 Rev C, OS-01, Site 01 Rev A, Site 02 Rev B, Flood Map and the submitted Design and Access Statement.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property has been enlarged with a rear dormer extension and the erection of a single-storey rear extension is underway.
4. The proposed extension would be less than half the width of the property and just under 3m deep. Its scale, massing and overall appearance would be sympathetic to the design and materials of the host dwelling and sufficiently subordinate, even when viewed together with the existing rear dormer. Although the hipped roof would create additional bulk at first floor level, it would better reflect the design of the host dwelling than a flat roof.

5. Turning to its wider context, the proposed extension would be at the rear of the property and would not be visible within the street-scene or from elsewhere in the public realm. There is design variety at the rear of the houses in the locality including extensions of varying heights and styles. Among these are first-floor extensions and roof alterations. Within this context the proposal would not appear out of place.
6. I conclude that the first-floor extension would sufficiently respect the character of the host property and other development within its context. The proposed development would therefore accord with the design requirements of Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policies CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014). There would be no conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. There is no evidence to support objections to this development on the basis that it would restrict light to a neighbouring back bedroom and result in a loss of light or privacy to a kitchen window. The Council confirms that the proposal satisfies its tests which are intended to avoid harm to neighbouring occupiers and there are no reasons to reach a different conclusion.
8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed. I have included a condition identifying the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. External materials are required to match those that exist.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR