

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2023

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3329943

33 Cranleigh Gardens, Southgate, Enfield, N21 1DR

- 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 Y Ahmet against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 23/01406/HOU, dated 2 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is an increase in height of the front roof, with raising of roof ridge, to create additional space in roof area, involving side rooflights and removal of 1x front rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an increase in height of the front roof, with raising of the roof ridge, to create additional space in the roof area, involving side rooflights and removal of 1x front rooflight at 33 Cranleigh Gardens, Southgate, Enfield, N21 1DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01406/HOU, dated 2 May 2023, 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: Site plan; Existing block plan; proposed block plan; and plans ref. 3010/11; 3010/12; 3010/13; and 3010/14.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Cranleigh Gardens.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached chalet bungalow in a quiet, residential street of other mainly semi-detached bungalows and houses. The bungalows on the same side of the street as the appeal dwelling were originally built to a similar design with hipped roofs, front projections under shallow pitched, hipped roofs and flat roofed attached garages to the side.
4. Over time a significant number of the bungalows have been altered. Some, including the appeal dwelling and both its immediate neighbours, have undergone hip to gable conversions and loft extensions. The appeal dwelling and its non-attached neighbour, as well as a number of other bungalows nearby including No 17, have converted the garages into habitable accommodation and extended the front hipped roof over the new accommodation. This has resulted in changes to the height and form of the front roof.
5. At the appeal dwelling and its neighbour a short front facing ridge has been created with a small crown roof behind. These dwellings have also re-roofed using grey tiles rather than the more common red tiles which adds to their distinctive appearance. At No 17 the front roof has been noticeably increased in height and pitch so that it has a larger crown and accommodation has been created in the enlarged roof space. It is understood that this is a recent alteration. Although different, none of these changes detract from the appearance of the dwellings or appear incongruous in the street scene.
6. The proposed roof extension at the appeal dwelling would be very similar to that seen at No 17. The pitch of the roof would be increased but the crown would remain below the level of the main roof, thus maintaining subservience. The front ridge would become shorter, owing to the increase in height but the overall form would remain hipped and in keeping with the style of the host bungalow. Moreover, the side facing roof light would be discreet. Overall, I find that it would be a sympathetic addition that would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and sit comfortably in the street scene of Cranleigh Gardens.
7. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed roof alteration would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene of Cranleigh Gardens. In consequence, it would comply with Policy CP37 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy 2010 - 2025, adopted 2010, and with Policies DMD 6 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document, adopted 2014. Taken together, and amongst other things, these require new development to be of a high quality of design such that the scale and form of development is appropriate to and in character with the existing pattern of development.
8. Turning to conditions, the Council suggests two conditions in addition to the statutory commencement condition. I agree that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in materials that match the existing building for the avoidance of doubt and to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR