



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2025

by **A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3359796

11 Crescent East, Enfield EN4 0EL

- 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 Koureas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/02786/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension, new flank elevation window and side access door, sliding doors to ground floor rear elevation and four new roof lights to proposed rear extension with new landscaping with permeable paving and to the front drive area. Replacement of roof concrete tiles with new slate tiles and incorporation of a single rear facing roof light as approved under application reference 23/03818/HOU. Replacement of front facing timber windows with new double glazed timber windows to match original design and reinstatement of original timber balustrade to 1st floor front bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension, new flank elevation window and side access door, sliding doors to ground floor rear elevation and four new roof lights to proposed rear extension with new landscaping with permeable paving and to the front drive area. Replacement of roof concrete tiles with new slate tiles and incorporation of a single rear facing roof light as approved under application reference 23/03818/HOU. Replacement of front facing timber windows with new double glazed timber windows to match original design at 11 Crescent East, Enfield EN4 0EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02786/HOU, subject to the conditions in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. In my decision above I have omitted reference to the reinstatement of a front first floor balustrade as this is not shown on the proposed plans.
3. The appellant has said planning permission¹ has already been granted for some of the proposed development including the replacement white painted double-glazed windows to the front of the property; new slate roof tiles; new black aluminium framed roof light to rear elevation; and new permeable paving to the front of the appeal property. The Council has not disputed this, and the appeal has been determined on this basis. I have therefore focussed in my reasoning below on the other proposed development, namely, the proposed single storey rear and side extension, the proposed replacement windows to the rear elevation and the proposed landscaping changes to the rear.

¹ Ref. 23/03818/HOU

Main Issue

4. Accordingly, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and the Hadley Wood Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires when determining proposals in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. At paragraph 210, the Framework sets out matters which should be considered, including sustaining, and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The Hadley Wood Conservation Area Character Appraisal, updated version dated September 2016 (HWCACA) says the area comprises a mixture of mainly semi-detached and detached properties that have regular plot sizes, building lines, and close spacing, that form a regular street frontage. The semi-detached properties are said to be arranged as mirrored pairs, mostly clad in red brick with complex rooflines, their appearance contributes to the area's distinctive character, and they are part of the significance of the CA. The Hadley Wood Conservation Area Management Proposals dated February 2015 (HWCAMP) identifies the loss of original architectural features from properties and the use of inappropriate materials, such as uPVC windows and concrete tiles as risks for the CA.
7. The appeal property is a semi-detached three storey hipped roof property, part of a mirrored pair of properties, that are both set within spacious and landscaped plots, that have generous setbacks from the road. The appeal property has red brick on its front elevation at ground floor level, with pebble dashed render at first floor, to the rear side, there is buff coloured brick at ground floor and pebbled dashed render above. Its hipped roof form is complicated and includes dormer extensions to its front, side and rear, along with an attached single storey garage and single storey side projection. I saw on my site inspection that the property does not have a first-floor balcony, contrary to what is said by the Council, and I have no substantive evidence of any such original balcony that may have existed previously that I can consider as part of the appeal proposal.
8. There have been two earlier planning permissions² granted for single storey rear and side extensions that wrap around the appeal property, and one of these extended some 4 metres from its rear elevation, and had a flat roof, and large areas of glazing. The approved single storey extensions did not align with the rear side of no. 9 which does not have any single storey rear extensions. Following a recent decision by the Council to refuse planning permission³ for a wrap-around single storey rear and side extension, the appeal scheme has been reduced in its size, now said to be 53 square metres (11 square metres smaller than previously

² Ref. 22/01057/HOU and Ref. 23/03818/HOU

³ Ref. 24/00923/HOU

proposed), and said to be 0.5 metres shorter in its projection beyond the rear elevation of the host property (at some 4.1 metres).

9. The modern design of the proposed extension, including its flat roof and fenestration, whilst different to the host property, would respect its character and appearance and not be harmful, and with it being single storey the significance of its upper floor and roof form would be retained. Although it would encompass an existing single storey part, because of its low height, and design, which would feature different projecting parts and break up its scale, it would not be a prominent addition to the appeal property. This would also be assisted by it being set 0.36 metres lower than the existing ground floor level of the appeal property. Furthermore, the scale of the proposed extension due to its reduced rear projection nearest to the boundary with no. 9, and its areas of glazing, it would not dominate the host property. In view of its single storey level, discrete location and design, the proposed extension would appear subordinate to the host property, and not unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties.
10. The proposed extension would retain an adequate separation to the boundary with no. 1 Lancaster Avenue, ensuring it would not create an unacceptable terracing effect. Due to its location both to the rear of the appeal property and behind its existing garage, together with intervening planting, it would not be readily visible from either Crescent East, Lancaster Avenue, beyond its rear boundary or from across the track to the side of no. 9. Furthermore, in view of its subservient relationship to the host property, its location, and that it would not unacceptably unbalance the architectural symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties, it would ensure the CA is not harmed.
11. The use of red brick at the rear of the appeal property would not match its existing buff coloured brick. However, that would largely be masked by the new extension. Furthermore, it would harmonise with its red brick on its front elevation, and be consistent with the HWCACA in terms of red brick being the predominant and defining external material in the CA. The proposed use of limestone effect porcelain for the proposed terrace would be a high-quality material that would not be inappropriate or harmful to the host property and the CA.
12. The proposed new roof lights would not be prominent given the flat roof design of the single storey extension that they would be located within, and although there would be some views of them from the adjoining property, such views would not be significant or dominant and they would be in the context of the proposed extension to the property.
13. The proposed replacement windows to the rear elevation would match the existing fenestration and glazing bars, and the proposed black aluminium framed windows would be consistent with those proposed on the extension, ensuring a high quality and matching appearance. It is also noteworthy that this aspect was also approved on an earlier application⁴ (now lapsed).
14. The proposed changes to the rear landscaping are said to be minor changes to what has been approved and are said to correspond to the lowered level of the proposed extension. This aspect would also be sympathetic to the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and the CA.

⁴ Ref. 22/01057/HOU

15. I am also content that the other parts of the proposed development that have already been granted planning permission⁵, would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA, the host property or the pair of semi-detached properties.
16. The Council has referred me to an appeal decision⁶ at no. 9 Lancaster Avenue that was dismissed for a single storey rear and side extension due to its jarring and incongruous effect on the host property, even though it had a limited scale. I have limited information about that proposal to compare it to this scheme. However, unlike that case, there has already been permissions granted for extensions to the rear and side of the appeal property, which likely means it is not entirely comparable to that earlier appeal scheme. As such I only attach limited weight to it in my decision. Furthermore, the Council referred to an approval at no. 15 Lancaster Avenue that was said to have preserved an existing balcony by being positioned underneath the rear terrace to protect its architectural features. I have insufficient information on that approval to properly compare it to the appeal scheme, so it is difficult to attach any weight to it.
17. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace it is part of, and the CA, consistent with the duty in the Act. In doing so, I find the proposal would comply with Policy D5 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, dated March 2021 (LP), Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD14, and DMD37 of Enfield's Development Management Document, adopted November 2014 (DMD), Policy CP31 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy 2010-2025, adopted November 2010 (CS), and Policies HW 1, HW 5, and HW 12 of the Hadley Wood Neighbourhood Plan 2022 – 2039 made November 2023, insofar as they collectively require new development to be high quality, conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, ensure an appropriate scale, bulk and massing that relates well to the locally distinctive and historic patterns of development, and for extensions to be subordinate to the host property and retain a minimum space of 1 metre to side boundaries to avoid a terracing effect.
18. Although there would be a degree of conflict with Policy DMD11, in terms of the proposed rear extension extending more than 3 metres from the rear elevation of the host property, and with their not being a common alignment of extensions with no. 9. However, as no.9 does not have a rear extension to align with and in view of the Council already having granted an extension that extends 4 metres from its rear elevation, the increased 0.1 metres in projection would not be materially different, and the proposed development would comply with the objective of Policy DMD11 of ensuring extensions are subservient to the host property.
19. The Council referred to the proposed development conflicting with LP Policy D8 which relates to the public realm, DMD Policies DM12 (outbuildings), DMD13 (roof extensions), and DMD6 regarding the density of new residential development. I did not find these policies to be directly applicable to the main issue on this appeal.

Other Matters

20. I have had regard to the comments raised by interested parties in addition to the main issue above, including the effect of the proposed development on the living

⁵ Ref. 23/03818/HOU

⁶ Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3283555

conditions of the occupiers of no. 9, from the raised and lower terraces, and the proposed roof lights on the proposed extension. In view of the separation distance between the nearest first floor and second floor windows on no.9 to the proposed rooflights and given that there would unlikely be direct views towards them from those windows, I am satisfied that they would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 9. I also saw on my site inspection that both properties currently have terraces on their rear elevations and there is a tall fence between the respective properties, and there was also considerable planting on the boundary, some of which was on the appellant's side. The proposed upper terrace, due to its diagonal alignment would be mostly positioned some distance away from the boundary to no. 9, which would help to lessen any privacy effects for the occupiers of that property. Subject to a condition regarding the boundary treatment between the two properties, including the planting that is to be retained along with details of additional planting, I am satisfied that there would be no harmful effects upon the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 9. It is also noteworthy that the Council did not identify any unacceptable effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

21. A standard implementation condition (1) has been imposed, along with a condition (2) listing the approved plans to provide certainty over what has been approved. A condition (3) is also necessary to ensure the external materials are those specified on both the application form and approved plans, to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the CA. Finally, to safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of no.9 and to protect the character and appearance of the area a condition (4) is necessary in respect of the boundary treatment and planting between no's 9 and 11.

Conclusion

22. The proposed development accords with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: drawing no's LP001; AR000 rev 01; AR001 rev 01; AR003 rev 01; AR004; AR005 rev 01; AR006; AR007; and AR009.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those specified on both the application form and on the drawing no's AR004; AR005 rev 01; and AR006.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of development precise details of the boundary treatment between no.9 and no.11 Crescent East, including details of the existing planting to be retained along with any new planting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority together with a timetable for their implementation. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken and maintained in accordance with the details thereby agreed and any trees or plants that are part of the agreed details, which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

End of Schedule of Conditions