



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2024

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/24/3334424

34 Eversley Park Road, London N21 1JU

- 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 and Mrs Arif against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 23/02878/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension and side window.
-

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front extension and side window at 34 Eversley Park Road, London N21 1JU in accordance with the terms of application ref: 23/02878/FUL and 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site location plan, 1:200 block plan, 08-23/01 Rev. A (existing ground floor and roof plan), (08-23/02 (existing front and side elevations), 1:200 proposed block plan, 08-23/03 Rev. A (proposed ground floor and roof plan), 08-23/04 (proposed front and side elevations), and 08-23/05 (existing and proposed sections).
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The proposed side window would face towards the shared driveway and being at ground floor level would not introduce any overlooking of the adjoining property to the north. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the single storey front extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the ground floor maisonette in a modern, two-storey, detached building. The front elevation has a central door with two windows either side on ground and first floor and is of brick elevations with hipped roof of profile tiles. It is one of three almost identical buildings that front Eversley Park Road, set back in a slightly staggered row behind generous open front gardens. Immediately to the north of the appeal site is a drive

which gives access to a parking area located to the rear of the group. Mature trees are located either side of the entrance to the drive.

4. From its junction with Houndsden Road to the south, Eversley Park Road runs downhill towards the appeal site. To the south of the appeal site group is a row of four pairs of older semi-detached dwellings, probably Edwardian, of more traditional appearance and grander three storey height and scale. Immediately to the north of the appeal site lie single storey bungalows which front Brookside, a road running east off Eversley Park Road. The first property (No. 1a) is detached and located to the west of No. 1, with flank elevation set quite close to the Eversley Park Road frontage, the boundary of which is marked by a close boarded fence. This dwelling is located wholly forward of the front elevation of the building on the appeal site.
5. The proposal would introduce a single-storey element forward of the building on the appeal site and the other two in the group as they are set further back in a slightly staggered row. However, given the much greater set back of this group compared to the bungalow to the north and due to its single storey height and its relatively modest depth, it would not appear unduly prominent in the street scene. Its impact would be further reduced due to the slightly lower level that the buildings lie relative to the pavement and the semi-detached row to the south, albeit it would project forward of them. Furthermore, visual separation would be provided by the generous front garden area.
6. The proposal would introduce a 'new' element to the uniform front elevations of the building group of which it is a part. However, the addition would be well designed, of matching appearance and form with hipped roof, sloping away from the road frontage and would be of a proportionate scale such that it would not be an unduly bulky addition. As such it would not detract from the pleasant appearance of this group in the street scene.
7. Overall, whilst the proposal would be visible in the street, I find that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore accord with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD6, DMD8, and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) which seek development in the public realm that is high quality, design-led and which has special regard to its context and is not inappropriate within it. They also require that extensions have no adverse visual impact, are in keeping with the character of the property, not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area and which do not disrupt the character or balance of the property or group of properties of which it forms a part.
8. With respect to conditions, as well as referring to the approved plans in the interest of clarity, a condition to require matching materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR