

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2023

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2024.

Appeal A Reference: APP/Q5300/D/23/3328181
4 Golf Ride, Enfield EN2 9DA

- 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 M. Seker against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application (reference 23/01423/HOU, dated 3 May 2023) was refused by notice dated 15 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as follows: *"single-storey rear infill extension, converting a garage into a habitable room, erection of two side dormers, including the alternation of the roof to form a Loft conversion and alterations to the front façade"*.
-

Appeal B Reference: APP/Q5300/D/23/3328191
4 Golf Ride, Enfield EN2 9DA

- 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 M. Seker against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application (reference 23/01457/HOU, dated 5 May 2023) was refused by notice dated 29 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as follows: *"single-storey rear infill extension, converting a garage into a habitable room, erection of two side dormers, including the alternation of the roof to form a Loft conversion and alterations to the front façade"*.
-

Appeal C Reference: APP/Q5300/D/23/3328197
4 Golf Ride, Enfield EN2 9DA

- 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 M. Seker against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application (reference 23/01485/HOU, dated 9 May 2023) was refused by notice dated 29 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as follows: *"construction of two side dormers roof extensions, together with the installation of one roof light to the front roof"*.
-

Decision

1. The appeals (Appeals A, B and C) are all dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issue to be determined in each of these three appeals is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. Golf Ride is located in a fairly extensive area of development that is detached from the main part of Enfield, in a countryside area to the north of the town. There is a conglomeration of commercial premises of varying types, with a residential enclave served by Rosewood Drive. Golf Ride is at the western end of the enclave, with a large golf course beyond (to the west). The road loops around at the end of the residential development and number 4 Golf Ride is located on the inside of the loop, on sloping land.
4. The dwellings in the residential enclave are mixed in character. Bungalows and two-storey houses are both to be found in the vicinity of the appeal site, including "chalet bungalows" with dormers and some accommodation at first floor level.
5. Number 4 Golf Ride is a modest bungalow in a conventional form. It appears to have some common characteristics with close neighbours but others have been previously extended. Number 4 itself has an attic "room" in the roof but the accommodation is essentially arranged on the ground floor, with four bedrooms, a kitchen, a dining/living room and ancillary facilities (according to the submitted floor plans).
6. The bungalow has a garage or store on each side, setting the main part of the building away from its neighbours, and the underlying ground levels slope upwards to the south, which creates variety in the streetscene. Number 4 is constructed of traditional materials, with rendered exterior walls under a tiled roof with hips on the front elevation. The main ridge of the roof extends back into the site, at right angles to the front boundary.
7. Like its neighbours, the bungalow is set back from the roadside with a front garden and space for car parking, although it is well screened by a large hedge and some other shrubs. There is also a good-sized back garden.
8. These three appeals make alternative proposals for enlarging the bungalow. Although the drawing numbering does not clearly distinguish the schemes, there are differences between them.
9. Appeal A would involve an increase in the width of the main part of the building, up to the northern boundary, with a large, pitched roof and an area of flat roof at the apex, maintaining the level of the existing ridge. The scheme would also introduce flat roofed dormers, on each of the side slopes of the main roof. A small porch with a hipped roof would be added to the front elevation.
10. Appeal B would produce a very similar outcome. It would also involve an increase in the width of the main part of the building, up to the northern boundary, with a large, pitched roof and an area of flat roof at the apex, maintaining the level of the existing ridge. The scheme would also introduce flat roofed dormers, on each of the side slopes of the main roof. A small porch

with a gabled roof would be added to the front elevation. The rear elevation would be as for Appeal A.

11. Appeal C would, again, be quite similar. It would likewise involve an increase in the width of the main part of the building, up to the northern boundary, with a large, pitched roof and an area of flat roof at the apex, maintaining the level of the existing ridge. The scheme would also introduce flat roofed dormers, on each of the side slopes of the main roof. In this case the front porch would be omitted, however, and a different treatment is proposed for the rear elevation.
12. The 'National Planning Policy Framework' emphasises the aim of "achieving well designed places" in the broadest sense (notably at Section 12), while making effective use of land and encouraging economic activity. It is aimed at achieving good design standards generally, by adding to the overall quality of the area and being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, although it is also recognised that appropriate change may include increased densities.
13. An emphasis on the importance of encouraging good design is also to be found in the Development Plan. Policies D3, D4 and D8 of 'The London Plan' (dated 2021) are especially aimed at encouraging high quality design, in a design-led approach. Core Policy 30 of 'The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025' (adopted in November 2010) focusses on "maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open environment" generally. Other Policies in the 'Improving Enfield Development Management Document' (adopted in November 2014) underpin the strategic approach, including Policies DMD8, DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37, certain of which are specifically concerned with residential extensions.
14. The principal elements of the proposals are the same in each appeal. The additional width would give the frontage a more built up appearance, although similar extensions have been carried out elsewhere. Indeed, number 2 Golf Ride is now built up with a gable on its southern boundary with the appeal site at number 4. The proposed side dormers would be a critical feature of the new schemes, however. The orientation of the main roof would result in one of the cheeks of each dormer facing the road, making the dormers especially obvious and intrusive. The "box-dormer" shape would be alien to the traditional pitched roof of the bungalow and the dormers would be awkward and ungainly, dominating the streetscene.
15. The dormers form a key feature of all three of the schemes and the same criticism applies to them all. Other differences between the front and rear elevations in the three schemes are not so significant that they would alter my conclusions in relation to the overall character of this basic design approach.
16. I am aware that some properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have been substantially modified, creating, in effect, a replacement dwelling with a new character. Such an approach would not necessarily be ruled out in relation to the appeal site, as the existing bungalow does not readily lend itself to conventional extensions, due to its scale and its orientation in relation to the street frontage. Furthermore, other buildings in the surrounding area are varied in style and character, in an irregular townscape.

17. In any case, however, the finished building would need to be in harmony with its surroundings, relating well to the scale and forms of other buildings. The proposed dormers in the current schemes clearly fail to achieve this and I am convinced that each of the schemes would cause unacceptable harm to the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area.
18. Evidently, the appeal site lies within an established urban area, which is "sustainable" in planning terms, and the proposed development would have the effect of creating a substantial dwelling. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the harm that would be done to the character and appearance of the surroundings very clearly outweighs the benefits of the project. Hence, I have concluded that the schemes before me would conflict with both national and local planning policies (including the Development Plan) and that they ought not to be allowed. Although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decisions on the three appeals.

Roger C. Shrimplin

INSPECTOR