
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19th September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/16/3153352

2a Green Dragon Lane, London, N21 2LD

- 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 S Joannou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/00336/FUL, dated 22 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension, rear dormer, 2x front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed rear dormer. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the first floor front extension and 2x front rooflights and planning permission is granted for a first floor front extension and 2x front rooflights at 2a Green Dragon Lane, London, N21 2LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00336/FUL, dated 22 January 2016, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and subject to the following 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: 2519/1; 2519/2; 2519/3; 2519/4; 2519/5; 2519/6.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development given above is the one provided in the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form. The description given in the application form has not been used as it is inaccurate, and refers to a hip-to-gable extension that does not form part of the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal property is positioned on the corner of Green Dragon Lane and Bush Hill. The rear roofslope can be viewed from the pavement on Bush Hill, and contains an existing centrally located dormer.
5. It is not in dispute that the proposed front extension, and 2 front rooflights, would be of an acceptable appearance and design. There would be no harm arising from this part of the development to the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area.
6. The Council's reason for refusal focused solely on the impact of the proposed rear dormer. This is physically separate from the other parts of the development which relate to the front of the property.
7. An appeal was previously dismissed for a pitched roof rear dormer in a similar location to the current appeal proposal. That decision (Ref APP/Q5300/W/15/3106086) was dismissed, in part, due to the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the host property. I attach significant weight to the previous Inspector's findings.
8. The proposed dormer would be much lower down the roofslope than the existing dormer, and it would be positioned tight up against a chimney. It would fail to maintain an appropriate distance to the chimney, and by virtue of its position, would unbalance the appearance of the rear roofslope. Its flat roof design would also jar with the pitched roof of the existing dormer. For these reasons, it would be an incongruous feature. Whilst the appellant states that the dormer would have limited visibility from the surrounding area, it would be clearly visible from the pavement along Bush Hill. The previous Inspector also concluded that a rear dormer in this location would be sufficiently visible to harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CP 30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD 13, DMD 37, and DMD 38 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014), and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR