
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025 by L Cuthbertson

Decision by T Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3375105

3 Merrivale, Enfield, Southgate N14 4SJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mandeep Heer against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/02943/HOU.
 - The proposed development is the extension of hipped roof to form crown roof with increase in ridge height, front dormer, rear balcony and front, side and roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Extension of hipped roof to form crown roof with increase in ridge height, front dormer, rear balcony and front, side and roof lights at 3 Merrivale, Enfield, Southgate N14 4SJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02943/HOU, and 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 no 2025-1069-101.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential suburban street characterised by large detached dwellings set within generous plots. The properties exhibit a mix of architectural styles and detailing, although many share common materials such as white render and brown brick. The street has a spacious and verdant quality, with tree-lined verges and properties set back behind front gardens and parking areas.
5. The host property is on a row of five dwellings. While originally seeming to have been constructed with hipped roofs, four of these properties have been altered to

incorporate crown roofs and other significant extensions. This pattern of development has eroded any sense of uniformity and has created a streetscape where individualised alterations dominate.

6. The proposed crown roof, increase in ridge height, and associated dormer and balcony would introduce additional bulk to the roof form. However, the scale of the host dwelling and presence of similarly substantial extensions at Nos. 1 and 5 mean the proposal would sit comfortably within the street scene. The design would be proportionate to the size of the property and would not result in an overly dominant appearance when viewed within the context of neighbouring dwellings.
7. Furthermore, the existing character and appearance of the area is now defined by a variety of roof forms and extensions rather than a consistent architectural rhythm. The proposal would therefore preserve the established character of Merrivale rather than harm it. The use of materials to match the existing dwelling would ensure visual continuity and avoid any discordant effect.
8. While the increase in ridge height is noted, this change would be read in the context of other enlarged roof forms along the row and would not materially disrupt the street's overall composition. The development would maintain the spacious and open feel of the area, with no additional encroachment to neighbouring properties.
9. For these reasons, I consider that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (2014) which together seek to ensure high-quality design and protect local character. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks developments that are sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

10. In the interest of clarity, I have attached conditions relating to the timing of commencement and the approved plans. I have not attached a materials condition as this is detailed on the approved drawing.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

L Cuthbertson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

T Law

INSPECTOR