The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3314246
98 Gloucester Gardens, Enfield EN4 0QP

- 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 Andrew Gregoriou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application Ref 22/03127/HOU, dated 8 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2022.
- The development proposed is an extension of the main roof to form gables to the sides, with rear and front dormers, raise the ridge to match the adjoining house, also raise the front gable wall and ridge to the minor front roof with velux windows to the sides all to create 2 bedrooms and a bathroom in the loft space.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension of the main roof to form gables to the sides, with rear and front dormers, raise the ridge to match the adjoining house, also raise the front gable wall and ridge to the minor front roof with velux windows to the sides all to create 2 bedrooms and a bathroom in the loft space in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/03127/HOU, dated 8 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 600/SP/01, 600/BP/01, 600/01, 600/02, 600/03, 600/04, 600/05A, 600/06, 600/07, 600/08, 600/09, 600/10, 600/11 and 600/12.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

   4) Before the extensions hereby permitted are first occupied, the second floor windows hereby permitted on the side elevations shall be glazed with obscure glass and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. The windows shall be retained in this condition thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the local area.

Reasons

3. Gloucester Gardens is a suburban street lined mainly by semi-detached houses of similar design. No 98 is a more modern detached house, near one end of the street. It has a much different configuration to its neighbours, with a narrow front gable, a hipped roof cross-wing and large, single storey elements on both sides. The proposal would raise and extend the roof, including hip to gable extensions, a small dormer window to the front and a large box dormer to the rear.

4. The proposal would consolidate and rationalise the existing fragmented and somewhat uncharacteristic form of the house, to provide a more substantial and proportionate central section that would be in line with the height of the neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses. The front dormer would be a minor feature that would sit back from the main frontage and fit well within the roofscape. The rear dormer would be much larger, but would still be set in from the sides and down from the ridge, so that it would not overly dominate the roof. There are similar rear dormer structures on nearby houses, so this would be in character with the area. The proposal would increase the overall bulk of the property significantly, but this would be in reasonable proportion to the house and its plot, leaving plenty of space to both sides at first floor/roof level.

5. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or the appearance of the house. It accords with the shared aims of London Plan policies D3 and D4, Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 policy CP30, Development Management Document policies DMD6, DMD13, DMD37 and the National Planning Policy Framework - to secure high quality development that is of a scale and form appropriate to the existing pattern of development, ensuring that roof extensions are in keeping with the character of the property and are not dominant in views from the surrounding area.

6. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the house and the local area. A final condition requiring obscure and fixed glazing of new high level side windows is needed to protect privacy at neighbouring properties, though no such requirement is justified for the new high level rooflights as these would be further forward. The Council has also suggested a condition restricting new side doors and windows, but I see no need for this, bearing in mind that the permitted development rights for such windows on upper floors are conditioned to require obscure and fixed glazing[1].

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR

[1] Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015