



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3335603

105 Cheyne Walk, Southgate, Enfield N21 1DD

- 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 Adam Lambrou against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 23/03092/HOU, dated 20 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey rear and side extension at 105 Cheyne Walk, Southgate, Enfield in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/03092/HOU, dated 20 September 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2023-966/601.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Permissions have already been granted to significantly extend this property. The rear dormer window is already in place. The difference between this proposal and what is already permitted and lawful relates to the first floor side extension above the already permitted ground floor side extension including changes to the frontage; and the rear first floor element of the extension which would be above the already approved rear single storey addition.
 4. The rear first floor element would sit below the existing dormer window and would have a flat roof. It would be set away from the boundary of the attached neighbour. Although there are allotments and public open spaces to the rear of this property, these changes would not be clearly evident, particularly given the greater prominence of the existing dormer. Although concerns have been raised about the scale and impact on the residents of the neighbouring
-

property, the works would not result in unacceptable harm to either the amenity of the neighbouring residents or the character or appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with the specific requirements regarding rear extensions set out in policy DMD 11 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) in this respect.

5. The first floor side extension would close the gap with the neighbouring property at first floor level, leaving only a narrow gap to the boundary. This gap would be overhung to an extent by the eaves of the roof. Whilst the neighbouring property is currently set away from the boundary at first floor level, a similar proposal relating to that house would result in only the width of a pedestrian access between them, with the eaves being even closer. Some of the houses opposite differ in character but on this side of the road, whilst gaps between the hipped roofs of these properties would have originally been a feature of the character of the area, this is no longer the case. Some have been altered to gable roofs and many have been extended close to the boundaries. Properties that have been extended close to the boundary with a gable roof do tend to be more dominant and their changed character more at odds with the original design of the neighbouring houses. However, generally the houses that have lower height, hipped side extensions or matching full height hipped roof extensions, continue to a large extent, to reflect the original house designs.
6. In this particular area, the gaps between houses have been eroded. However, the use of hipped roofs and the retention of some distinction between neighbouring buildings has ensured that the house designs are in keeping and the limited space between them has become a prevailing characteristic. The existing property has approval for a hip to gable alteration that has already been carried out. This is at odds with the character of the house and the area generally, despite some other examples. The retained gap allows views of the side of the large rear dormer which represents a poor design feature and detracts from the appearance of the property. The proposal would result in a hipped roof which would be more in keeping and would prevent views of the rear. Although it would close the gap and perhaps encourage a similar neighbouring proposal, overall, given the changes already implemented and the character of the area in general, this would result in a more satisfactory overall design for the house and would not alter the prevailing character of the area.
7. Given my conclusion that the design would not be out of keeping with the original house design or the designs of the houses that have already been extended; and the closing of the gap between properties would not result in harm or indeed a significant change to the prevailing wider character of the area, the proposal would not be contrary to the general design requirements of policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010); DMD policies DMD 8 and DMD 37; or policy D4 of The London Plan (2021).
8. The proposal would not disrupt the character or balance of the property or materially affect the character of the area as described by the more detailed requirements of DMD policy DMD13 with regard to roof extensions. DMD policy DMD 14 relates specifically to side extensions and seeks to avoid a continuous façade or 'terracing effect' where this would be out of character with the locality. It advises that a minimum distance of one metre to the boundary should be retained. The proposal would not provide this distance and would

lead to a more limited break in the façades. The hipped roof design would assist in reducing the terracing effect but this would not address the lack of any set back from the main house or the limited retained gap to the boundary. However, the result would not be out of character with the area and the design would not be at odds with the original detailing of the house or with others in the street. The justification for the policy raises concerns with regard to side extensions, if developed right up to the side boundaries and accepts that in certain cases, this would be out of keeping with the character of the locality. Nevertheless, there would be conflict with the policy's specific requirements. However, given the proposed hipped roof and the changes that have already been accepted to this house and the wider prevailing character, the proposal would not be at odds with the overall objectives of the policy.

9. The proposal does not represent poor design in this particular context in relation to the *National Planning Policy Framework* 2023. It is likely to function well and would be of a design that would improve the current approved appearance of the house and maintain the overall quality of the area.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would be acceptable in design terms and it would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area. It would meet the design objectives of the development plan generally although there would be some conflict with elements of DMD policy DMD 14. The proposal would result in some economic benefits; and social benefits with regard to the improvements to the fabric of the house and the living conditions of the future occupants. It would also offer some environmental benefits from the screening of the rear dormer. In conclusion, the benefits of the proposal outweigh the limited policy concerns. I therefore allow the appeal.
11. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The plans set out the details of the materials to be used and the need for some obscure glazing. A condition in relation to these matters is not therefore necessary.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR