



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2024

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3343156

2 Henrietta Gardens, London N21 3BF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Michelle Bennett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 23/04139/HOU.
 - The development proposed is erection of additional storey.
-

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of additional storey at 2 Henrietta Gardens, London N21 3BF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/04139/HOU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site location plan, drawing nos: 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1001 Rev02 (site plan existing), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1002 Rev02 (existing ground floor), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1003 Rev02 (existing first floor), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1004 Rev02 (existing second floor), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1005 Rev02 (existing roof plans), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E1-DR-A-1011 Rev02 (existing elevations), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E2-DR-A-1012 Rev02 (existing elevations), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E3-DR-A-1013 Rev02 (existing elevations), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E1-DR-A-1014 Rev03 (existing elevations streetscape), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2001 Rev02 (site plan proposed), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2002 Rev02 (proposed ground floor), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2003 Rev02 (proposed first floor), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2004 Rev02 (proposed second floor), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-XX-DR-A-2005 Rev02 (proposed roof plans), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E1-DR-A-2101 Rev02 (proposed elevations), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E2-DR-A-2102 Rev02 (proposed elevations), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E3-DR-A-2103 Rev02 (proposed elevations), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-E1-DR-A-2104 Rev03 (proposed elevations streetscape), 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-S1-DR-A-2201 Rev02 (proposed sections) and 294-N213BF-URB-ZZ-S2-DR-A-2202 Rev02 (proposed sections).

Main Issue

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area including the Winchmore Hill Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modern, two-storey, terraced property located within a small private gated development off Compton Road. It lies at the southern end of the terrace, set back from but facing towards the road, with the other properties facing east towards the railway line which is separated from the terrace of properties by a vegetated embankment. The south-east boundary of the CA runs along the top of this embankment.
4. The wider CA comprises of a mixture of building styles, including terraces, semi-detached and detached, of varying ages, including Victorian, Edwardian and post war age. The central part comprises mainly terraced buildings containing shops, restaurants and housing which front and enclose the village green (The Green) retaining a pleasant village appearance and atmosphere. Hoppers Road runs south from The Green with the long residential terrace fronting the eastern side, to the west of which is the appeal site.
5. The Winchmore Hill Green Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CACA) notes the handsome Neo-Jacobean style Salisbury Arms public house and the chunky mansard roofed Compton Terrace, a two-storey Victorian terrace stepping up the hill, both located along Hoppers Road, as the most important buildings which define the character of the part of the CA in which the appeal site is located. The CACA identifies the terrace of buildings at Henrietta Gardens as being a neutral building. The significance of the CA is derived from the retention of the atmosphere of an historic village centre and the concentration of high quality buildings providing an interesting and attractive streetscape.
6. The main terrace comprising numbers 3, 4 and 5 Henrietta Gardens, has a pitched roof with flat roofed dormers to the front and rear, set behind a rear parapet roof edge, with two storey flat-roofed projections enclosed by parapet roof edge with railings to the front. The appeal site lies at the southern end and at right angles to the rest of the terrace, comprising a two-storey projecting 'wing' to the rear of number 3 with flat roof enclosed by parapet edge extending to a height roughly level with the eaves of the terrace. It appears as a contrasting element to the main terrace, with main elevation facing south towards Compton Road, albeit it is finished in brick and render elevation to match.
7. I have been referred to an earlier appeal decision in 2017 relating to a flat topped mansard roof with dormer windows to the front at the appeal site.¹ The appeal was dismissed, the Inspector noting the attractive vista from Compton Road comprising the 'carefully conceived side elevation' and high quality soft and hard landscaping, concluding that the appeal site and wider development are settled within their surroundings and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area and significance of the CA. I agree with these findings. The Inspector also found that the proposed development in that case, would conflict with the original design, the mansard roof creating a third floor

¹ APP/Q5300/D/17/3174020

- that would increase the scale and mass of the dwelling, eroding its subservient design in relation to the wider terrace.
8. The roof addition in this earlier appeal scheme extended over the whole depth and width of the building up to the parapet roof edge. The deep sloping roofs contained two flat-roofed dormers in the south elevation, with overall height only just below the ridge of the main terrace. The Inspector referred to the 'large tiled façade with dormers' appearing incongruous in relation to the existing relatively uncluttered side elevation.
 9. The scheme before me is significantly different from the 2017 appeal scheme in terms of its size, position, height, form and external appearance. It would be set back over 2 metres from the slightly raised front parapet roof edge and set in from the rear roof edge. This, taken together with its reduced size, would ensure that it would not appear to significantly increase the scale or mass of the dwelling. The design of the proposed addition with vertical walls in grey cladding and wholly flat roof with small secondary sloping roof element, would complement the contemporary form and appearance of the existing building rather than conflict with it.
 10. The secondary, sloping roof element would be a relatively discrete element, the slope of which would reflect that of the main terrace. The raised parapet would extend above the height of the eaves and front projection but not by a significant amount and would remain below the rear parapet of the main terrace such that this alteration would not unbalance the visual composition of the building.
 11. Overall, I find that the proposed second floor addition has been carefully designed to address the concerns of the Inspector in respect of the earlier 2017 appeal scheme. It would be a complementary addition that would maintain the subservient appearance of the principal, south elevation of the dwelling on the appeal site. Due to its design and size, it would not compete with the gable end of the main terrace, which would retain its appearance as a focal point as viewed from Compton Road. As such the positive contribution made by the building to the CA would be maintained.
 12. Therefore, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or wider area and would preserve the character or appearance of the CA. It would thereby accord with Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD8, DMD13, DMD37 and DMD44 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan (2021) which seek development in the public realm that is high quality, design-led and which has special regard to its context. They also require that extensions have no adverse visual impact, that roof extensions are of appropriate size and location, in keeping with the character of the property, not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area and which do not disrupt the character or balance of the property or group of properties of which it forms a part. They also seek to ensure that the special interest and significance of a heritage asset is conserved and enhanced.
 13. For the above reasons, it would also satisfy the policies of the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment, conserve heritage assets in manner appropriate to their significance and achieve well designed places that are visually attractive and sympathetic to the built environment. I have had regard to the duty under Section 72(1) of the

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and am satisfied that the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.

Other Matters

14. Concerns have been raised regarding potential overlooking but I agree with the Council that given the existing relationship, no unacceptable loss of privacy would be introduced. Furthermore, given my findings above, there would be no loss of visual amenity.
15. The Council has suggested conditions to require accordance with the approved plans and use of matching materials. However, the latter is not necessary as the plans detail the materials to be used.

Conclusion

16. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR