



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10th April 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 8 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3337690

74 Hoodcote Gardens, Winchmore Hill, Enfield, London N21 2NE

- 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 Meredith Power against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref.23/03101/HOU, dated 21 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is a "single storey rear and part two storey side extension and roof extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached property with a two storey side extension and accommodation in the roof space. Its semi-pair is no.76 Hoodcote Gardens, which is on a slightly lower level, has had a hip-to-gable roof extension (amongst other things) and a rear dormer. The properties are on the west side of Hoodcote Gardens with no.76 to the north. The properties have rear gardens and the road is residential in nature.
4. The proposal includes demolition of a rear conservatory, erection of a single storey side to rear extension, a hip-to-gable roof extension, a rear dormer with Juliette balcony and a side to rear first floor extension with Juliette balcony. The hip-to-gable end roof extension would add some balance to the appearance of the two semis when viewed from the front together.
5. There is already accommodation in the roofspace of no.74 with modestly-sized fenestration facing the garden. The siting and dimensions of the proposed dormer structure would not unduly harm the appearance of dwelling from the rear as there would be a comfortable set in from the northern end of the semi's roof and a noticeable set-up from the eaves.
6. The proposed first floor side to rear extension would have a roof ridge which would sit below the flat roof of the dormer. It would have a front hip on it reducing its bulk slightly. In depth it would be about 3m from the original first

floor rear wall and have a width of about 5m. It would be flush with the existing flank wall facing no.72 Hoodcote Gardens. The width of the original appeal dwelling is about 8.9m and so at about 5m wide the first floor side to rear extension would be more than half the width of the dwelling which would appear excessively wide and disproportionate and would unduly dominate the rear façade.

7. When the proposed dormer and the first floor side to rear extension are taken cumulatively, they would also result in a disproportionate and bulky addition to the rear of the dwelling. The sizeable roof form of the first floor side to rear extension would not blend coherently with the dormer structure. Furthermore, the proposed Juliette balcony in the dormer would be unduly wide with 4 full length panes of glass drawing the eye up to roof level and exacerbating the top heavy appearance of the dwelling. The result would be unsympathetic bulky additions with designs which detract from the appearance of the host dwelling.
8. Whilst the streetscene would, in my view, see a small benefit, there are both public and private views of the proposed development to consider and I find that from the rear there would be harm to the host dwelling and harm to views of nos 72 and 76 which take in the proposed development. That would constitute harm to the wider residential character of the area.
9. In coming to these conclusions, I have borne in mind that dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site have been extended including installing dormer structure extensions. Not all dormer structures are sympathetic to their host dwellings or the wider area. There is little information on whether dormers which have been brought to my attention are the result of planning permissions, the use of permitted development rights or are unauthorised. Nevertheless, they do not, in my view, alter the essential character of the area or reduce the harm I have identified from the proposal before me.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would be contrary to policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2010) and policies DMD11, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014).

Conclusion

11. Having taken into account all representations made, including the benefits that flow from having additional living accommodation in the dwelling, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR