



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/24/3337919

43 Lakenheath, Southgate, London N14 4RJ

- 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 Dorian Vreto against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref.23/03604/HOU dated 3 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 43 Lakenheath, Southgate, London N14 4RJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref.23/03604/HOU dated 3 November 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, JS/SP/1732/01-A, JS/SP/1732/01-B, JS/SP/1732/02, JS/SP/1732/03, JS/SP/1732/04, JS/SP/1732/05, JS/SP/1732/06, JS/SP/1732/07, JS/SP/1732/08 and JS/SP/1732/09.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling with an additional roof dormer storey. Its semi pair is 41 Lakenheath. It is located on the west side of

Lakenheath. No.45 Lakenheath is a detached two storey property located on the south side of the appeal site on the corner of Wolverton Way.

4. The proposed development is a first floor rear extension. This would sit on top of the existing full width rear single storey extension. It would be very approximately half the width of the main house and would be situated towards the southern end of the flat roof. It would have a pitched roof with a front hip. Its depth from the main rear elevation would be about 3m. It would have one rear facing window which would match the fenestration on the rear upper storeys of the house.
5. In terms of the proposed scale, it would sit comfortably back from the rear elevation of the ground floor extension and not be unduly prominent or dominant. The rear dormer is a large structure extending almost the full width of the roof but it sits just below the main ridgeline and comfortably above the eaves line. The proposed extension would have a reasonably shallow pitch on its roof with the ridgeline running into the front face of the dormer structure. Rather than having a gable end, it would have a front hip which reduces its mass.
6. Whilst the ridge of the extension would not sit below the dormer in its entirety, it would not significantly intrude into the face of the dormer. I consider this would not be unduly visually awkward or unsympathetic given that the dimensions of the proposed extension are not unduly large or deep. In design terms in my view the proposal is preferable to a flat roof on the proposed extension.
7. In coming to this view I have taken note of appeal decision ref. APP/Q5300/D/17/3189311 which considered a larger first floor extension and found the proposed pitched roof to be an awkward juxtaposition to the rear of dwelling. The proposal was not on all fours with the appeal before me and I have judged this proposal on its own individual merits and its own individual dimensions. I do not find the proposal before me to be likely to result in a confused or cluttered appearance and I do not find the flat roof style of the dormer and ground floor extension to contrast in an unsympathetic fashion with the proposed pitched and hipped roof. I find that the proposed roof of the extension would add interest of an appropriate design.
8. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed first floor rear extension would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the wider area and would not be contrary to policies DMD11 or DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014), policy CP30 of Enfield's Core Strategy (adopted 2010) or policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the potential impacts of the development on the residential amenities of no.45 Lakenheath. Given the location of no.45 to the south of the appeal site and the gap between the properties the proposal would not unduly affect the daylight or sunlight reaching the windows or rear garden. Furthermore, an unrestricted 30 degree line can be taken from the mid point of the nearest first floor window at no.45 Lakenheath because the corner of the proposal is chamfered. As to sense of enclosure, the location of the proposal

and its modest depth would be sufficiently separated from any window or the rear garden of no.45 so as to cause undue loss of outlook. I note that the Council agree with me that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of no.45 through loss of light or outlook or be contrary to policy DMD11 of Enfield's Development Management Document.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in the light of advice in National Planning Practice Guidance. A condition is imposed in order to tie the development strictly to the approved plans. This is to avoid uncertainty. In order to safeguard the character of the host dwelling and area there is a condition requiring the external materials to conform with the existing facing materials used in the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

11. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal subject to conditions.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR