



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3368522

138 Wynchgate, Southgate Enfield N21 1QU

- 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 Elton Qafaliaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/01257/HOU.
 - The development proposed is Roof alterations including dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed roof alterations including dormers at 138 Wynchgate, Southgate, Enfield N21 1QU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01257/HOU, and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan; Block Plan; 138/WG/10 Floor Plans; 138/WG/11 Second Floor Plan and Roof Plan; 138/WG/12 Front and Rear Elevations; 138/WG/13 Side Elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal within the banner heading varies from the Council's description included within their decision notice. I note the appellant has used the same description within their appeal form. In the interest of consistency, I have followed this through in my decision letter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. Wynchgate is a particularly long residential street located close to Southgate and dissected by other roads leading to further residential streets. Wynchgate and this general area is densely built up with predominantly semi-detached or detached houses. Along Wynchgate, the houses are finished in coloured render, part brick,

- peaked gable ends to houses, hanging tiles to bays and hipped roofs a characteristic of the street scene.
5. The dwellings that flank both sides of Wynchgate have evolved over some period of time as many are distinctly early 20th century houses set within large plots and others have the appearance of a traditional mid 20th century style set in narrower grounds.
 6. The appeal site is an earlier 20th century two storey dwelling occupying a generously sized plot on the southern side of Wynchgate. At the time of my visit, the dwelling was surrounded by scaffolding and shrouded. Nevertheless, I was able to experience its residential context.
 7. The appeal site forms part of a group of three dwellings, numbers 138-142 Wynchgate of the same era and sharing the same design characteristics. They have hipped roofs with a chamfered double height front bay window, first floor square bay window and overhanging eaves. As part of their planned design aesthetic, the roof incorporates two joined hipped roofs, described by the Council as an 'M' shaped roof. The second hipped roof is subservient to the main roof with a lower ridge line.
 8. The proposal would replace the existing roof configuration by providing a hipped roof above that appears from the front elevation to be a single roof and connects all hips into a flat roof, with a peaked gable end feature above the first-floor bay windows. A dormer window would be placed centrally within the front of the roof, as well as a single dormer to the rear roof plane.
 9. Although the appeal site forms part of a small group of similar typologies, it sits adjacent to 136 Wynchgate and is experienced in the context of these semi's, consisting of a group of around five pairs. Whilst they have similar design characteristics to the appeal site, they are different dwelling types and styles. The character of houses changes again beyond this group of semi's. A further character change to the housing style along this side of the street is visible beyond Number 142. Number 144 is more akin in vernacular to the proposal as it appears as a single roof formation, central dormer to the front and a balanced proportionality to it. The character of houses changes again further to the east, along this side.
 10. My findings are that the houses throughout Wynchgate are not uniform in their age, typology, design, style or scale. There is some consistency to grouping of houses and broad materiality. However, there is no consistent continuity to the houses here which forms part of its distinctiveness.
 11. There would be a degree of change to the front façade of the dwelling as a result of the proposal, more specifically associated with the roof configuration as the bulk of the roof would increase, although a large proportion of the front façade would remain substantially unchanged.
 12. The Council comments they do not generally support front roof dormers in this location. Taking into account the policy specification, in this specific situation, the dormer would be centrally positioned of an appropriate design and in proportion to the bulk of the roof. It would not over-dominate the roof or appear visually intrusive. In this circumstance it would broadly relate to the centrally positioned dormer at Number 144, even if that one is smaller in scale, they are seen in the same context.

13. As is required of me, I must have an understanding of the local surroundings and context. All things considered, I have taken into account the fact the dwelling is detached and of a larger scale to the houses within pairs of semi's, its relationship with the adjacent semi's and the diverse character of the street scene. I have come to the view that the proposal would not be viewed as isolated and incongruous within the group of houses it was originally designed as part of and would acceptably blend with the mixed character along Wynchgate. Therefore its distinctive character would be protected.
14. To conclude on this main issue, the proposed development would therefore be policy compliant with regards to Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy, 2010-2025 in its broad aims to secure high quality design, and Policies DMD 13 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document 2014 which requires roof extensions to follow specific design criteria and all development to adhere to good design principles and local distinctiveness and context. However, I find no direct relevance to policies DMD6 and DMD8 of the Development Management Document as they do not relate to residential extensions to dwellings.

Other Matters

15. I have read the objector's concern that the dwelling may be used as an HMO. There is no evidence before me to substantiate this claim and therefore I cannot comment further.
16. The Council raises no objections regarding the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of local residents, highway safety and biodiversity. There is nothing before me to lead me to conclude differently on these matters.

Conditions

17. Whilst on site, it was clear that the dwelling has been undergoing works. I am unaware if these required planning permission and am furnished with no further details. As I am granting planning permission for the proposal before me only, it is necessary to include a time limit to commence works and to build in accordance with the approved plans in the interest of good planning. The materials shall also match those of the host building in the interest of completeness.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR