

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3165047

11 Farmlands, Enfield EN2 8JE

- 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 Gary Zouvani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/03113/HOU, dated 8 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer loft conversion to include raising the roof ridge line and rendering the front of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling which is located towards the head of a cul-de-sac fronted by a mix of similar dwellings and bungalows. The dwellings either side of the property are of the same design and have not been altered above ground floor level. The proposed development includes an increase in the ridge height of the property's roof and the erection of a rear roof dormer.
 4. Although sited to the rear of the property, the proposed dormer would be visible from neighbouring gardens and The Ridgeway from viewpoints adjacent to the public house and petrol filling station. A side elevation of the proposed dormer, the higher roof ridge and 4 rooflights within the front roofslope would be seen from Farmlands.
 5. As noted by the appellant, there are differences in the ground levels of the property when compared to the neighbouring dwellings. Within the context of the different levels, the proposed limited increase in the ridge height of the existing roof would not be so conspicuous so as to represent a material change to the property's contribution to the current character and appearance of the
-

streetscene. There would remain a stepping down of the ridge heights between No. 13, the property and No. 9.

6. There are rooflights within the front rooflopes of some properties fronting The Farmlands but these are not as closely sited together as those of the proposed development. Although the erection of 4 proposed rooflights erected close together would appear as cluttered additions to the front roofslope, this matter alone would not be a reason for this appeal to fail.
7. However, I share the Council's concerns that the scale of the proposed rear dormer would be a significant addition to the property. This element of the appeal scheme would not be a subordinate addition but would visually dominate the rear elevation of the property. The lack of subordination of the dormer would be particularly associated with its roof not being set down from the proposed ridge and this lack of setting down would also accentuate its scale. The scale and incongruous design of the proposed dormer and its visual dominance of the rear roofslope would be noticeable from the viewpoints which have been identified.
8. Although there are some elements of the appeal scheme which could be acceptable, including the rendering of the front of the property, when the proposed development is assessed as a whole these elements are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified associated with the rear dormer.
9. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (LP), Core Policy 30 of Enfield's Core Strategy and Policies DMD 13 and DMD 37 of Enfield's Development Management Document (DMD). Amongst other matters, these policies promote high quality development appropriate to its context and for roof extensions both to be of an appropriate size and to be in keeping with the character of the property rather than be dominant when viewed from the surrounding area. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design. No specific conflict has been identified with DMD Policy DMD 8 which applies to new residential development rather than extensions.

Other Matters-

10. The appellant's comments about the potential harm of the appeal scheme associated with the unbalancing the property being a matter for the owner have been carefully noted. However, this is a case where proposed development causes harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, consequently, conflicts with relevant policies of the development plan. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR