
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3258603

14 Colne Road, London N21 2JD

- 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 Tanimul Barnard of Goldeneye Estates against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01241/HOU, dated 17 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations incorporating gable end and extended rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to form a hip to gable roof extension to side with side window and rear facing dormer at 14 Colne Road, London N21 2JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01241/HOU, dated 17 April 2020, and the plans with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 4B and 5.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity and precision, I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the application form. However, in my decision I have taken the description given on the Council's decision notice and appeal form, as it is more accurate and has been agreed by the appellant.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached house, which is located in a residential suburb. The predominant house types in the immediate locality of the site comprise terraced and semi-detached houses. Whilst the host dwelling is detached, its proximity to No 16 Colne Road, ensures that it does not appear

out of place in the street scene. Thus, the host dwelling complements the neighbouring properties.

5. My attention has been drawn to an appeal¹ (the previous scheme) for the host dwelling, which was for a scheme to extend the property, and was subsequently dismissed last year. Whilst there are similarities with the previous scheme and the scheme subject of this appeal, particularly through the hip to gable conversion, it also included a further storey being added to the existing 2-storey rear outrigger. The current scheme again involves a hip to gable conversion, which I do not consider would cause harm to the visual amenities in the surrounding area, due to the variety of existing roof styles present on neighbouring properties, including gable ends. I also note on the elevation of the host dwelling facing No 16, a gable end is present.
6. The existing flat roof rear dormer window would extend across the roof of the 2-storey outrigger and would return to the rear roof slope of the host dwelling, part of which would be formed by the hip to gable conversion and set in from the gable end. Whilst the proposed development would be readily visible from the street, particularly Solna Road, it would not appear unduly bulky or create clutter on the rear elevation. The extensions would complement the appearance of the host dwelling and would appear subordinate to it, which would ensure that it would not form a strident feature within the street.
7. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. This would comply with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016; Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010; Policies DMD 8, DMD 13, DMD 37 of the Development Management Document 2014 and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Q5300/D/20/3253911