



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2023

by J N Seymour BA (hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3315600

45 Crescent West, Enfield, London, EN4 0EQ

- 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 Eracleous against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 22/03589/HOU, dated 20 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2023.
 - The development is described as 'Side extension incorporating gable end roof and rear dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is the design of the proposed extension, with regard to preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Hadley Wood Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached property situated on Crescent West, a curved street which is characterised by dwellings built in a similar architectural style that are set back from the road in an elevated position. The appeal proposal consists of an extension to the side of the dwelling to be constructed on top of a hipped roof section at second floor level to create a new bathroom.
4. The Hadley Wood Conservation Area (HWCA) Character Appraisal states that the dwellings on Crescent West are characterised by high pitched roofs with hipped ends, complex rooflines with multiple gables and tall chimneys. The hipped end on the side elevation would be lost in the proposed upward extension which would obscure from public view the larger of the two chimney stacks to the rear of the property. Therefore, two of the key characteristics identified in the Character Appraisal that this dwelling possesses would be diminished by the appeal proposal.
5. It was noted on my site visit that whilst the pairs of semi-detached dwellings on Crescent West conform to a similar architectural style, there were also subtle variations in their roof forms and fenestration. There appear to have been modest alterations and extensions to many of the dwellings, however I disagree with the appellant that this is evidence of the character and

- appearance of the area changing over time which would thereby justify the appeal proposal.
6. What has remained consistent in the street scene of Crescent West is a clear hierarchy in the arrangement of the dwellings. Despite the subtle variations noted above, they typically consist of a three-storey core, with a two-storey section to the side and a further single storey section to the side again. The tiered design is a key characteristic of the dwellings on Crescent West that is emphasised by the hipped roofs which gradually reduces the scale and massing from the centre of each dwelling outwards to their side elevations.
 7. Policy DMD13 of Enfield's Development Management Document (DMD) states that "*roof extensions to the side of a property must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or pair or group of properties of which the dwelling forms a part*". The proposed extension would create a new dual-pitch gable with its ridge line extending perpendicular to the principal ridge line of the main dwelling running front to rear due to the configuration of the gables on the front and rear elevations.
 8. It is acknowledged that the appeal proposal and the attached neighbour at 47 Crescent West are not perfectly symmetrical. However, due to the size, design and positioning of the appeal proposal it would have an unbalancing effect in this case. The appeal proposal consists of a significant sideways protrusion that is contrary to the style in which the dwellings were originally designed and constructed. This would be exacerbated by the proposed use of pale coloured brick because, whilst this matches the structure upon which the extension would be built, from the street scene it would contrast significantly from the main dwelling which is constructed primarily with red brick and red hung tiles.
 9. The design of the proposed extension deviates from the tiered architectural style identified above on a part of the dwelling clearly visible from within the street scene of the HWCA. Therefore, I consider the appeal proposal to conflict with Policy DMD13 and because it ultimately fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the HWCA, there is also conflict with Policy DMD44 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan.
 10. The scale of the harm to the character and appearance of the HWCA is judged to be less than substantial, but in reference to paragraph 202 of the Framework this would not be outweighed by any public benefits. The only benefit described by the appellant is a private benefit taking the form of an additional bathroom for the residents of the property. The lack of public benefit to outweigh the less than substantial harm I have identified results in the appeal proposal conflicting with paragraph 202 of the Framework.

Other Matters

11. There is dispute between the parties whether extensions constructed at other dwellings nearby should be considered for the determination of this appeal, including the decision to permit such extensions in relation to the timing of the adoption of the HWCA Character Appraisal. Ultimately, other extensions permitted nearby are not particularly relevant in any event as each case should be assessed on its individual merits, which is precisely what I have done when determining this appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I judge that the appeal is dismissed.

J N Seymour

INSPECTOR