



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2023

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3323888

18 Greenbrook Avenue, Enfield EN4 0LS

- 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 Nico Beukes against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01091/HOU, dated 3 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is the extension of roof at sides to form gable ends, front and rear dormers with front rooflights, with Tudor panels at first floor level and retiling of roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension of roof at sides to form gable ends, front and rear dormers with front rooflights, with Tudor panels at first floor level and retiling of roof at 18 Greenbrook Avenue, Enfield EN4 0LS, in accordance with the terms of the application, 23/01091/HOU, dated 3 April 2023, 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: A101, 3D- A103 and Floor Plans & Sections (Dated 12/03/2023).
 - 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 building.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development used in documents submitted for this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this is a full and accurate description which has also been used by the appellant for their statement.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a larger two storey detached house with a hipped roof and feature front gable. It sits on a relatively deep plot with a good sized front garden with an in-and-out driveway arrangement. However, due to its location close to the corner of the junction of Greenbrook Avenue with Newmans Way, the appeal plot narrows considerably to the rear, resulting in a more generously proportioned front as compared to rear garden.
5. The appeal dwelling is located in an area made up of detached houses, which sit widely across their plot with limited space between dwellings. This appears to be a spatial characteristic of the local area. Similar to the appeal dwelling, the houses in the local area are also generally expressive of an English vernacular architectural influence, in a variety of styles and materials, as is common in residential areas of this type.
6. The proposal is for a hip to gable roof alteration that would raise the existing lower part of the roof by approximately 0.5 metres. Two small dormer windows with hipped roofs would be inserted into the resulting extended front roof slope. These would be symmetrically positioned either side of the existing expressed feature gable. Between the feature gable and roof ridge, a pair of closely aligned roof lights would be inserted into the front roof slope.
7. To the rear the proposal includes 3 dormer windows with pitched roofs, a larger one centrally positioned in the rear roof slope with 2 smaller ones symmetrically positioned on either side. The proposal also involves the replacement of the existing roof tiles, with natural slate and the application of Tudor style panels referencing a half-timbered vernacular to first floor level and the proposed gable ends. This would reflect the existing Tudor stylings of the appeal dwelling.
8. The relatively small scale of the proposed extensions and their amalgamation into the style and form of the existing house would not result in them appearing intrusive or dominating. Rather, the proposals would appear as subordinate and sympathetic alterations and additions to the appeal dwelling, which would respect its existing scale and architectural expression.
9. Whilst the majority of the houses in the local area exhibit hipped roof forms, there are, however, also examples of houses with gable ended roof forms within the street and wider local area. Others, like the appeal dwelling have expressed front feature gables. There are also many examples of traditionally formed dormer windows in the area, similar to those proposed. Within this context the change from a hipped to gable roof form with dormer windows as proposed, would not appear out of keeping with the established streetscene of the local area.
10. Further, the proposed hipped to gable change would create a larger gabled roof form, it would not however result in the appeal dwelling being any closer to the existing side boundaries. As such I find that the proposal reflects the spatial characteristics of the local area that I have identified above. The proposal would not, therefore, result in the appeal dwelling appearing as a discordant addition to the streetscene or detrimental to the open character of the area.
11. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the

local area. As such, it would comply with policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), policies DMD8, DMD13, DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). Collectively these seek development that is high quality and design led, reinforces locally distinctive patterns of development, and has no negative impact on streetscene.

Conditions

12. Along with the standard condition setting out the time limit for commencement of the development, in the interests of design quality I have included conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and use of materials that match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR