The Planning Inspectorate

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/23/3333244
4 Kingwell Road, Enfield EN4 0HY

- 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 Prestcote against the decision of Enfield Council.
- The application Ref 23/02742/HOU, dated 17 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2023.
- The development proposed is a single storey front extension, extension to roof at sides to form gable ends together with front and rear dormers and front and rear rooflights.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension, extension to roof at sides to form gable ends together with front and rear dormers and front and rear rooflights at 4 Kingwell Road, Enfield in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02742/HOU, dated 17 August 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: 1688.P2.01A, 1688.P2.02A and 1688.P2.04A.

   3) The external materials shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The council consider that rear dormers in isolation would be acceptable but the proposed front dormers, roof extension and raised roof ridge would result in a detrimental impact on the street scene and the character of the area. It appears that the existing dwelling sat between two detached properties of similar scale and character, with hipped roofs. One of the neighbouring properties has been substantially extended and re-modelled. Although it retains a hipped roof, it is of greater height and the substantial depth of the crown roof ensures that it now dominates its neighbour when viewed from the west. In these circumstances, extending the roof to a gable and increasing its height would help to limit views of the side elevation of the neighbouring property and

this would reduce the perceived depth and prominence of that property. Roof forms in the area are not consistent with both gable and hipped roofs. The proposed change would not therefore interrupt a uniform characteristic.

4. The relationship with the neighbour to the west, which retains a similar form and proportions to the appeal property, would be more significant. It would reduce the perceived spacing between the dwellings. The new gable, together with its higher ridge, would result in it being more dominant. However, the increase in height would be relatively limited, particularly given the overall scale of these houses. Clear distinction between the houses would be maintained and in any event, the proximity of houses to their neighbours along this street is not a defining characteristic. Many are closely related and have adjoining gables. The horizontal emphasis of the original design would not be lost.

5. The proposal includes two front facing dormer windows. These have been designed to be relatively limited in scale. They would emphasise the existing horizontal detailing associated with the design of this property and would complement the proposed front extension and the existing front window detailing. Although not particularly common features within this street, there are other front dormers nearby. In any event, given their limited size and subservience with regard to the overall scale of the roof, they would not detract from the appearance of the house or the wider area.

6. Overall, the proposed alterations would represent a good standard of design and despite the increase in scale and the change in roof form, the property would continue to sit relatively comfortably within the street scene. The works would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the area. It would not therefore conflict with the general design objectives of policy D3 of the London Plan (2021); policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), or policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (DMD). DMD policy DMD13 has more specific requirements for roof extensions but the proposal would not conflict with these as it would not be overly dominant or intrusive and would not be out of keeping. There would also be no conflict with the similar design objectives of policies HW1 and H12 of the Hadley Wood Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2039 (2023); or the design objectives of the *National Planning Policy Framework* 2023.

7. Given my findings and as there are no other matters that weigh significantly against the proposal, I allow the appeal.

8. 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. A condition would require that the materials match in order to ensure that the property would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR