



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

**by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 March 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3241799**

**7 Pevensey Avenue, Enfield EN1 3HX**

- 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 Peter Tew against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref 19/02806/HOU, dated 8 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is 'Demolish existing upper side extension and rebuild full height with gable end wall and loft conversion.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to 'Demolish existing upper side extension and rebuild full height with gable end wall and loft conversion' at 7 Pevensey Avenue, Enfield EN1 3HX, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/02806/HOU, dated 8 August 2019, 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: Unnumbered Drawing 1 of 1 (Drawn by K Read, version amended 19/8/2019).
  - 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 effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. Policy DMD14 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (the DMD) permits side extensions where they do not result in the creation of a continuous façade of properties, have due regard to the character of the local area, the bulk and dominance of the structure along the street frontage and their subordination in relation to the host dwelling.
4. The extended dwelling would stand virtually on the boundary of the site with 5 Pevensey Avenue. However, the neighbouring property forms part of a semi-detached pair which addresses the corner of Pevensey Avenue and Bodiam Close at a roughly 45° angle to the appeal dwelling. As such, the side elevation of No 5 does not align with that of No 7, but angles away markedly. Therefore,

notwithstanding the position of the extension on the boundary, the dwellings would not appear as a continuous façade, but would still be read as two separate semi-detached pairs.

5. In terms of scale, I saw significant and varied side additions to nearby properties, including at Nos 5, 9 and 13. The proposed extension would match the height and building lines of the existing dwelling, creating a unified shape and enhanced appearance compared to the existing mansard addition. While the pair at Nos 7 and 9 would not align, they already differ in the massing of their side additions, and the proposed change would not exacerbate this difference to a significant degree. Given this varied immediate context, the additional massing would not appear excessive or result in an overly dominant dwelling within the street scene.
6. The Council further opposes the angled gable end to the side elevation, citing hipped roofs as the prevailing roof form in the area. However, in addition to the smaller gable to No 9, both 11 Pevensey Avenue and 1 Cowdrey Close have created gable ends through rear dormer extensions. Whilst I accept that hipped roof forms are most common, there is sufficient variety within the immediate context of the site that a gable end, even at an angle, would not appear discordant in form or interrupt a consistent roof or massing pattern.
7. I saw that full width rear dormers have been added to the pair of dwellings at 11 Pevensey Avenue and 1 Cowdrey Close and form an immediate presence in views from the rear garden of the appeal site. Within this context, the proposed rear dormer would not appear uncharacteristic or incongruous, and its position to the rear means it would be subject to only glimpsed views from the public realm and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. No objection was raised to the proposed front canopy I have no reason to reach a different view on this element of the proposal.
9. Taking these matters together, I find that the building resulting from the proposed extensions would be acceptable in scale and form, having regard to the surrounding context, and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with the aims of the development plan to secure high quality design in new development, as articulated in Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD6, DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the DMD. In addition, I find no conflict with the similar design-related aims of London Plan (March 2016) Policy 7.4.

### **Conditions**

10. To provide certainty, a condition is required specifying the relevant drawings. It is also necessary to impose a condition requiring external surface materials to match the existing dwelling in order to secure a satisfactory appearance.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the foregoing reasons and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision should be taken at variance with this. The appeal is therefore allowed.

*K. Savage* INSPECTOR