



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3274676

7 Meadway, Southgate, N14 6NY

- 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 Ms Jessica Ross against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/00357/HOU, dated 1 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension to roof to form gable end with rear dormer involving Juliet balcony, flank window and front rooflights and adjustments to internal layout.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to roof to form gable end with rear dormer involving Juliet balcony, flank window and front rooflights and adjustments to internal layout at 7 Meadway, Southgate, N14 6NY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00357/HOU, dated 1 February 2021, and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 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: 52999-4500, 52999-4100, 52999-4101, 52999-4102, 52999-4103, 52999-4200, 52999-4201 and 52999-4300.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the proposed flank window at second floor (loft) level to the left side elevation, indicated on drawing no. 52999-4200, has been fitted with obscure glazing. No part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room or part of the staircase in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscure glazing and non-openable parts of the window shall be retained permanently thereafter.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the decision notice is different to that on the application form. I have adopted the former as it more accurately describes the appeal proposal.
3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). However, the policies that are relevant to this appeal have not changed and there was no need, therefore, to invite the parties to make further submissions in response.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and Meadway Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the Meadway Conservation Area (MCA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires, therefore, that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. A similar policy is to be found in the Framework, as well as in policy CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 (ECS) and policy DMD44 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (EDMD).
6. Whilst the Council have provided a map of the MCA, no other evidence has been submitted in relation to the MCA designation. There is no assessment within the Council's Delegated Report of the architectural and/or historical qualities of the area that contribute to its special interest or to the contribution that the appeal site makes to the Conservation Area as a whole. The only assessment before me is the Appellant's Heritage Statement. The latter states that the area is characterised by its limited number of detached and semi-detached houses that exhibit a wide range of architectural materials and features, which give individual properties their own distinct appearance, as described in the Meadway Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2015.
7. Based on my observations on site and the evidence before, the commentary from the Heritage Statement appears to provide an accurate analysis of the architectural and historic qualities that contribute to the importance of the Meadway to the whole of the MCA. However, in my judgement, the street trees and soft landscaping/hedging interspersed along the roadside edge to the pavements on either side of Meadway equally contribute to the special character of the area.
8. The appeal proposal is for a gable end extension and rear roof dormer with Juliet balcony. The proposal also includes a flank window and front rooflights, to which no objections are raised. In relation to the roof extensions, the Council contend that due to the materials, style, bulk and excessive scale, they would be detrimental to the character of the host property and the MCA.
9. The appeal site is located on the southern side of Meadway. It comprises a two storey semi-detached property. Its neighbour, 9 Meadway (No.9), which forms that other half of the semi, is also two storeys, but it is not a mirror image of the host property and differs in terms of its style, form and materials, a theme, as confirmed above, repeated within the surrounding area. As I also observed

on site, a number of the surrounding properties have been altered and extended, and this includes roof dormers, a particular example of which is the rear dormer to No.9.

10. The Council contend that existing roof dormers either pre-date the Conservation Area designation or are not visible within the public domain. Whilst no further evidence has been provided in relation to those cases that might pre-date the designation, where roof dormers do exist, as on No.9, they are an inherent part of the local context to which regard must be had. Also, there is no evidence or reasoning before me as to why, in principle, rear dormers would not be acceptable within the MCA provided they were of a high quality design and finish. The same findings apply to the principle of gable end extensions, which are a common form of roof extension.
11. Within that context, the existing hip end to the main roof of the host property would be extended to form a gable end. Whilst I accept that this would involve a change to the appearance of the front elevation, it would not, in my judgement, significantly affect the character or appearance of the host property or the contribution that it makes to the MCA. As I confirmed above, there are a variety of roof styles and building forms within the area. Some properties have projecting gables at the front or two storey gables to the side (including No.9). The proposed gable end would not, therefore, be out of character within that context, it would be subservient and proportionate and would add to the variety of building styles/forms that is a feature of the area.
12. The proposed roof dormer would be sited at the rear and largely screened from public vantage points, albeit it would be visible from neighbouring properties. The proposed dormer is shown, on the submitted plans, as sitting well above the eaves and well below the ridge to the host property. It would also be set in from the edge of the main roof (as extended) and from the common boundary with No.9. In view of this, and through the use of a pallet of materials to broadly match existing, I am satisfied that the proposed dormer would sit comfortably on the roofscape, that its scale and bulk would not be excessive nor would it result in any harm to the character or appearance of the host property or the MCA.
13. Policy DMD13 of the EDMD states that roof extensions will be permitted where the criteria to the policy are met. In this particular case and having regard to those criteria, the appeal proposal would be of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane; the proposed dormer would be inset from the eaves, ridge and edges to the roof; the proposal would not be unduly dominant when viewed from the surrounding area; and, it would not disrupt or unbalance the character of the host property or the pair of properties that it forms part of.
14. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposed development would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the host property and MCA and would thus be in accord with policy D4 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, policy DMD13, DMD37 and DMD44 of the EDMD, policy CP30 and CP31 of the ECS, and the corresponding policies of the Framework.

Other Matters

15. I have had regard to the concerns raised by interested parties specifically in relation to the incremental nature of the additions to the host property and loss of privacy/overlooking. Based on my own observations on site and the

submitted plans, I am satisfied that none of these issues would result in any significant harm and I note they are not issues that the Council have raised in relation to this appeal. However, in relation to the proposed flank window, whilst this is shown on the submitted plans to be obscure glazed and non-openable below 1.7 metres, I propose to include a condition to this effect.

Conditions

16. The Council has suggested various conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. Conditions requiring compliance with the submitted plans and for materials to match existing, are necessary and reasonable in order to secure a high-quality development and to reflect the details included within the application. I have, however, added a list of approved plans. In addition, the submitted plans show the proposed flank window to be obscure glazed and non-openable below 1.7 metres, and I have, therefore, added a condition to this effect in order to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusions

17. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR