



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3309107

109 The Chine, Southgate, Enfield N21 2EG

- 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 and Mrs Papachristou against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01306/HOU, dated 14 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two-storey side extension and installation of rear dormer windows and rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single, part two-storey side extension and installation of rear dormer windows and rooflights at 109 The Chine, Southgate, Enfield N21 2EG in accordance with the terms of the application, 22/01306/HOU, dated 14 April 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Site Location Plan – Drg. No. 1577/00; Block Plan – Drg. 1577/01; Plans as Existing – Drg. No: 1577/02 A; Elevations as Existing – Drg. No: 1577/03 A; Plans as Proposed - Drg. No: 1577/04 A; Elevations as Proposed – Drg. No: 1577/05 A.
 - 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 dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Grange Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No.109 The Chines (No.109) is a large, detached two-storey dwelling within the Grange Park Conservation Area (CA). The CA is relatively tightly drawn consisting of three principal roads: The Chine and Old Park Ridings, two long broadly parallel roads; and The Grangeway which bisects them toward their southern end. No.109 is located on the western side of The Chines, close to its northern end as it sharply turns to meet Old Park Ridings.

4. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) gives a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) further advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation.
5. The *Grange Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (June 2015)* (CACA) describes the significance of the CA as derived, in large part, from its cohesive group of houses built between 1910 and the 1930s, one of the first high quality planned suburbs in the Borough. Consistent with the analysis of the CACA, I observed on site that the southern part of The Chine is very consistent in architectural character, but the northern part (where No.109 is located) has more diversity, with dwellings being more varied in design and built on larger plots.
6. The CACA recognises that the tightly planned layout of the CA offers minimal scope for major change, or even side extensions to properties. It is clear, however, from the CACA Character Appraisal Map 2 that the layout of the northern part of The Chines is not as tightly planned and No.109 itself has a very large plot and wider frontage than its neighbours, with the two-storey part of the existing house set close to its northern boundary. It is therefore a dwelling that I find has scope to accommodate appropriate change.
7. No.109 has a single two-storey projecting gable with a hipped roof and gablets, constructed in a mixture of red stock brick work and render below the tiled roof. To the side of No.109 is a single storey conservatory (finished in render with a lantern roof) and detached garage, both set well back from the front elevation of the dwelling. It is proposed to replace the conservatory with a two-storey side extension around 5m in width that would continue the principal elevation of No.109, finished in brickwork and render to match the existing. The side extension would replicate the existing gable, including the projecting bay and window detailing, and extend the hipped roof. The second gable, with a hipped roof and gablet, would reduce the overall massing of the extended roof and provide a broadly symmetrical profile and appearance to the front elevation.
8. I observed on my site visit that dwellings at the northern end of The Chines typically have asymmetrical roof forms, but it is the variety of roof forms, styling and detailing of dwellings, rather than the absence of any real symmetry, that contributes to their character and appearance. I also saw other examples in the CA, notably to the south on The Chines, where dwellings have a broadly symmetrical appearance to their front elevation. Rather than upsetting or disrupting any distinctive rhythm or pattern of roof forms, the proposed extension would result in a pleasing visual balance to the front elevation that would not appear overbearing or out of keeping with the streetscene of The Chines. At worst, I find it would have a neutral impact, and would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
9. On the rear (extended) roofslope it is proposed to construct two small dormer windows. The first would be sited centrally above a new (smaller) window on an existing slightly projecting bay. The second would be of similar proportions and design but would have a different alignment, set higher on the roof plane than the first. Combined with the proposed rooflight, the alignment of windows

at roof level lacks some design coherence but given the proportions of the windows and the scale of the roof, it would not result in a 'cluttered' appearance. Further, No.109 has a very generous garden that backs onto the railway and semi-public views of the rear roofslope would be limited to those neighbours on either side. I do not therefore find that the proposed dormers, despite their alignment, would be a particularly prominent or incongruous addition that would cause harm to the host dwelling or wider area.

10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. It would not therefore be contrary to the statutory provisions of S72 of the Act, or Policy 31 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) (CS), Policy DMD 44 of the Development Management Document (2014) (DMD), Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 (LP) or the guidance in the Framework. It would further comply with CS Policy CP30, DMD Policies DMD6 and DMD 37 and LP Policy D4 which together require development to be of high quality design, appropriate to its context and the existing pattern of development.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard condition imposing a time limit for commencement, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring materials to match those used in the existing dwelling is also necessary to ensure a high quality design.
12. The Council have proposed a condition that would preclude any means of enclosure on the roof of the extension, or its use for recreational purposes. I note that the proposed side extension would be offset a reasonable distance (around 6.8m) from the boundary with No.107 The Chines and no part would have a flat roof. I am also mindful of the guidance at paragraph 54 of the Framework that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so. In the absence of any justification from the Council, save to '*safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties*,' I am not persuaded that the condition is necessary and it has not therefore been imposed.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR