



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3370661

14 Chestnut Close, Southgate, Enfield N14 4SE

- 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 Harminder Shergill against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01711/HOU.
 - The proposed development is described as a single storey rear, front extension and roof extension with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The properties on this part of Chestnut Close are arranged as alternating semi-detached and detached two storey dwellings, which are set back from the tree-lined road in long straight rows. The buildings are mostly finished in white render, and almost all have a principally hipped roofed form. These attributes contribute to the cohesive grain, rhythm and appearance of the streetscene, and to the area's locally distinctive character.
4. The host comprises a detached, two storey, white rendered property, with a mainly hipped roof. It also has a two storey side extension, whose flat roof is higher than the eaves of the original house, resulting in a rather awkward form and appearance. However, as it is set back behind the host's bay window and it is finished in matching materials, and given flat roofed extensions to the side of some nearby properties, it does not jar significantly in the streetscene.
5. The scheme would include raising the roof across the whole of the building, which would terminate with gables either side, and the insertion of a centrally positioned dormer to the rear. Cumulatively, these alterations would give the property a markedly greater scale and bulk. Thus, whilst the flat roofed two storey side extension would be subsumed into the resultant building, very little of the building's original form and proportions would remain legible.
6. I do not have streetscene elevation drawings to show how the resultant building's ridgeline would compare to the semi-detached pairs either side. However, given

their mainly hipped roofed form, the raised roof and the gables would result in a domineering relationship with them. The building's form, and its roof level scale and bulk, would be markedly at odds with the overwhelmingly hipped roofs which are so characteristic of Chestnut Close.

7. The host benefits from a Lawful Development Certificate for two side dormers and a rear dormer¹. However, as depicted on drawing nos. 3072/5B and 3072/6B, whilst those dormers would be large and would have a rectilinear form, they would be on the original part of the building, and would be set well back from its front face. Although that proposal would result in a rather disjointed appearance, compared to the scheme before me it would be more modest in scale, and the original hipped roof would remain clearly legible. Thus, the impact of that fallback on the streetscene would be less dominant and less harmful.
8. The proposed single storey rear extension would be modestly proportioned, and I understand that the neighbouring properties have rear extensions. Consequently, I agree with the Council that it would not have a harmful impact. The scheme would not therefore conflict with Policy DMD 11 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) ('EDMD'), which addresses rear extensions.
9. However, for the above reasons, the scheme would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with London Plan (2021) Policy D3, Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), and EDMD Policies DMD 13 and DMD 37.
10. Collectively, and amongst other things, these require high quality design, which has regard to the site's context and to locally distinctive character, by reference to matters including scale, appearance, shape and proportions; and set out that roof extensions shall be in keeping with the character of the property, and should not be dominant when viewed from the surrounding area.
11. It would also conflict with the similar National Planning Policy Framework (2024) requirement for good design as a key aspect of sustainable development, and for development which is sympathetic to local character.
12. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals shall be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, material considerations do not lead me to conclude other than in accordance with the development plan.
13. Consequently, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: 25/00334/CEA