



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2025

by **L N Hughes BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3368092

9 Broomfield Avenue, London N13 4JJ

- 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 Elena Cook against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00123/FUL.
 - The development proposed is internal alterations to Flats 1, 2, and 3, including replacement of ground floor side/rear door with window and rear outrigger roof extension to Flat 3.
-

Decision

1. The decision is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form description is 'internal alterations to Flats 1, 2, and 3, including the creation of a rear roof extension to Flat 3'. The decision notice and appeal form use the description as above. As this provides better clarity, I have used this as the basis for my decision. A revised 'Existing Roof Plan' accompanied the appeal (PL104A Rev B). As this only aims to correct a hatching error on the previous version, and reflects the position as existing, I have accepted this into the evidence.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the preservation or enhancement of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached 3-storey properties, and has been converted into 3 flats. It has extant permission for a detached double garage to the very rear of its plot (24/02482/FUL). The only element of the appeal proposal in dispute is the proposed dormer style outrigger extension. As did the Council, I find no harm arising from the other proposed works.
5. Broomfield Avenue lies within the Lakes Estate Conservation Area (CA), and so I have a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. The Framework Section 16 also requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The London Plan Policy HC1, the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (CS) Policy CP31, and the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) Policy DMD44 broadly reiterate this Framework guidance. They

identify that developments should have regard to the special character of heritage assets, and respect and enhance the asset and conserve its significance.

6. The significance of the CA arises from the architectural and historic interest of the large and cohesive area of high quality Edwardian houses, developed over an unusually short period between 1904 and 1914. Almost the whole of this residential area has survived without major infill, replacement, or structural alteration. The Lakes Estate was one of the earliest and most exclusive residential areas in Southgate. It forms a dense residential area, with a simple road layout consisting principally of a series of roughly parallel streets, and dwellings set slightly back on a continuous building line.
7. House designs were influenced by the picturesque, vernacular revival and Arts and Crafts styles, and display exceptional decorative quality. The great majority are close spaced substantial 2-storey semi-detached houses. The pattern of front gardens with decorative boundary walls and traditional planting also contributes to an archetypal suburban townscape. Plot size and street frontage are remarkably uniform, and the overall impression is of continuous lines of building, softened by street trees.
8. Broomfield Avenue was completely built up by circa 1908 and displays the special properties outlined above, although with a distinctive character from its developers experimenting with design to maximise accommodation on slightly wider plots than average. Its houses were among the best in the area. The appeal site lies within numbers 1-19 (odd) on the east side. These are closely spaced pairs with curious gabled bays projecting from improbably steep attic roofs, which actually hide flat roofs behind. This design creates an illusion of traditional architecture, but allows for a second storey as large as those beneath it. Their paired rear projections have pitched tiled roofs with the apex along their joint boundary.
9. The rear of these properties lacks the ornate architectural detailing of the front elevations, plus contain paraphernalia such as satellite dishes and pipework. Unlike its neighbours, the appeal property has also been altered from the original brick with decorative lintels, to pebble-dash render, and has smaller and modern uPVC casement windows. As such there has been some loss of historic legibility, and design symmetry. Nonetheless, it still holds merit in its contribution to the significance of the CA in terms of its original architectural form, when considering the properties individually and as a grouping.
10. The proposed rear dormer would preserve the height and character of the main roof, use matching materials, and would be set in from the outrigger roof in compliance with the inset standards in the DMD Policy DMD13(a). However, it would increase the party wall height by 0.95m to achieve this, and would add substantial bulk. As such it would dominate this rear roofscape, and also significantly unbalance the symmetry of the pair. This would be further apparent due to the consistent unbroken roofscapes of the paired dwellings to either side, drawing attention to this variance. It would break the existing skyline from some street level viewpoints.
11. The dormer could only be viewed from the rear, and not all the paired dwellings are apparent from any single street level vista due to existing outbuildings and vegetation. However, their cohesiveness can still be appreciated while travelling along Pilgrims Close, and I also find it evident that the upper floors of the Pilgrims

Close dwellings opposite allow for encompassing vistas. The CA's significance can still be appreciated from this area despite low footfall and high crime levels. Even assuming construction of the appeal site's consented garage, clear views of the proposal would remain possible from some public and private vantage points along Pilgrims Close, and neighbouring gardens.

12. There have been other rear elevation additions and alterations to several of the properties on this eastern side of Broomfield Avenue, including an additional full floor extension above the No. 3 outrigger. There are also multiple rear dormers on the western side of Broomfield Avenue, visible from Broomfield Park. However, each proposal must be assessed on its own merits. Even were I to assume that all these alterations benefit from planning permission given under the same current local development plan and Framework policy context, they do not alter my consideration of the specific roofscape context of the appeal site.
13. The proposal would thus cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset, within the upper range of that spectrum of harm to which the Framework paragraph 212 requires that I give great weight. The Framework paragraph 215 requires less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
14. Flat 3 is identified as currently being 36.2sqm of gross internal floorspace. This is substantially below the 50sqm required by the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) and the London Plan Policy D6 for a two-person 1-bedroom flat. The dormer would add a bedroom and increase the floorspace to 70sqm, and thus meet the two-person 2-bedroom flat NDSS requirement. This would clearly improve the living conditions for the Flat 3 occupants. Although the proposal would not increase the size of the other two flats, which would remain below the NDSS, it would rationalise their internal layout and thus improve living conditions slightly. I give moderate weight in favour to this benefit. There would also be very minor economic benefits from construction and increased occupation.
15. Nonetheless, the great weight to which I give the less than substantial harm to the CA would outweigh the proposal's public benefits when applying the Framework paragraph 215. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the Lakes Estate CA. In this regard it would conflict with the London Plan Policy HC1, the CS Policy CP31, and the DMD Policy DMD44 as already outlined above.
16. The proposal would also cause moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the London Plan Policy D3, the CP Policy CP30, and the DMD Policies DMD8, DMD13, and DMD37. Together and amongst other matters, they require that developments must be high quality and design-led, have special regard to their local context and distinctive identity, be of appropriate scale, bulk and massing, and for roof extensions to not disrupt the balance of a pair of properties or be dominant when viewed from the surrounding area.

Conclusion

17. In conclusion therefore, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

L N Hughes

INSPECTOR