



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2024

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3346954

95 Vera Avenue, Southgate, Enfield, N21 1RN

- 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 Mr Mehuan Omar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/00598/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side and rear extension with flank windows, together with rear dormer and side roof light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey side and rear extension with flank windows, together with rear dormer and side roof light at 95 Vera Avenue, Southgate, Enfield, N21 1RN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00598/HOU, 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: Location Plan, Block Plan: 95 OS 01, 95 FP 01, 95 FP 02, 95 FP 03, 95 FP 04, 95 FP 05, 95 FP 06, 95 FP 07, 95 FP 08, 95 FP 09, 95 FP 10.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house of traditional design set in a street of mainly semi-detached houses and bungalows of similar age. Although there are design differences and there are some newer dwellings, the overall character and appearance is one of a well-established, spacious, suburban estate.

4. The appeal dwelling retains much of its original form. It has a ground floor that is typical of this type of dwelling. However, the first floor is noticeably smaller, accommodating just two bedrooms under a long, side facing, catslide roof. Its semi-detached pair, No 93, is similar but has a side dormer at first floor. The appellant points out that a number of other dwellings nearby were originally of a similar form to the appeal dwelling but have been extended through substantial side extensions, comparable with the appeal proposal. I saw numerous other similar examples in Uplands Way, a continuation of Vera Avenue, and in some cases the treatment of each dwelling in the semi-detached pair was visibly different.
5. The Council is concerned that the limited set down from the main ridge and set back from the front elevation of the appeal proposal would fundamentally alter the shape of the dwelling. I agree that the shape would be significantly changed to a more conventional form but there are many similar alterations nearby which have an acceptable visual effect both on the host dwelling and the wider street scene. Notwithstanding the limited set back, the proposed alterations would ensure that the line of the original catslide roof remained clearly visible, and the extended roof would be noticeably lower than and distinct from the main roof. I therefore find that the appearance of the extensions in terms of the main façade would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.
6. The Council is also concerned that the proposals would result in an overly bulky appearance when viewed from the front and side. In terms of the front elevation, the extensions would appear substantial but not overly bulky since the proportions would be similar to other more conventionally designed dwellings nearby, including the non-attached neighbour. The side elevation would be in a single plane, with a number of openings. However, the moderate scale of the proposed rear extensions would limit its depth. It would be seen from the street, at an angle, between the appeal dwelling and No 97. Owing to the position of the dwelling on a bend would have a greater degree of visibility than average. Nevertheless, it would not be overly prominent, and its bulk would be no greater than that of many other side elevations nearby, including at No 97 which has an existing two storey rear extension.
7. The Council is generally satisfied with the appearance of the rear elevation, including the modest dormer window. I agree that both the rear dormer and the two storey rear extension are well proportioned. The extension's lower ridge height and small set back from the rear of the single storey extension would ensure that it appeared clearly subservient. I also agree that the single storey rear extension which would occupy the full width of the dwelling would be acceptable, particularly in view of the existing rear extensions at No 93.
8. The Council suggests that the proposed front and side extensions would detract from the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair. However, whilst the two would appear different I do not find this unbalancing unduly harmful. There are other examples nearby of unbalanced pairs due to different extensions on each dwelling which have been satisfactorily absorbed into the varied pattern of development in the locality. Moreover, I have no evidence to suggest that similar extensions on similar semi-detached pairs have been permitted and/or undertaken at the same time. I do not therefore consider that the proposed development would result in material harm in this respect.

9. Finally, the Council has not suggested any reason why the proposals at the appeal dwelling should be judged differently from other similar extensions nearby. Whilst each development must be judged on its own merits, as I have done, the presence of similar existing development is a material planning consideration to which I have had regard.
10. I am aware that the appeal site has been the subject of a number of earlier applications and dismissed appeals. However, the Council acknowledges that the current scheme has undergone amendment and whilst they do not find the proposed changes sufficient to make the development acceptable I, for the reasons set out above, take a contrary view.
11. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed extensions would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair or the surrounding area. In consequence, they would comply with Policy D4 of the London Plan, 2021, Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025, 2010, Policies DMD8, DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Council's Development Management Document, 2014, and the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together and amongst other things these expect new development to achieve a high quality of design which, in the case of residential extensions, is appropriate in terms of scale and massing such that it is in keeping with the character of the host property and the local area and has no adverse visual effect.
12. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, the Council suggests two further conditions. I agree that the development should be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and also in materials that match the existing dwelling. This is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the representations of a neighbouring third party, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR