

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3168290

8 Hardy Way, Enfield, EN2 8NN

- 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 Neil Ross against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/05033/HOU, dated 24 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear hip to gable conversion, 4No pitched roof side dormers, and the insertion of 2No Velux windows into the side roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of the area around Hardy Way.

Reasons

3. Hardy way is a cul-de-sac leading south off Lavender Hill and it contains a mix of bungalows and two-storey houses. No 8 Hardy Way is a detached bungalow situated at the southern end of the road, close to the head of the cul-de-sac. At this point, Hardy Way swings round to the west, such that No 8 is readily seen along Hardy Way from the junction with Lavender Hill
 4. No 8, in common with most of the dwellings along Hardy Way, has a hipped roof. It appears as a low, narrow bungalow in the street scene, although it is a deep building within a long plot. It has a single-storey rear extension which continues the original roof line and accentuates the horizontality of the dwelling. The proposed alterations would include the conversion of the rear hip into a gable end, and the insertion of 2 dormer windows into each side roof slope. The dormers would be around 3 metres deep, with hipped, crown roofs, and would be set down just a little from the ridge of the roof, and set in a small distance from the eaves.
 5. In the context of the host dwelling, the proposed dormers would appear bulky and dominant in the roofscape. They would introduce a feature uncharacteristic in the street scene at the southern end of the road, where all of the dwellings on the south side, with the exception of No 7, are low-rise, hipped-roofed
-

bungalows. Such an incongruity would be accentuated by the prominent position of the bungalow at the bend in the road, where the low horizontality of Nos 8 and 9, together with that of Nos 22 and 23 opposite, are a significant visual feature.

6. The appellant contends that the appeal property is seen in the context of the adjacent No 7, which is a two-storey dwelling having a complex roof structure and a rear dormer. However, this house marks the end of a row of two-storey houses on the eastern side of the road, while the dormer is very small, contained within the rear roof-slope and barely visible in the street scene. No 8 relates to the row of similarly designed bungalows of which it is part, and the proposed dormers would be an uncharacteristic addition to that row.
7. The appellant also notes that the current proposal is a revision to an earlier scheme, which was also refused planning permission, and which involved the insertion of a much larger single dormer in each of the side roof slopes. The current proposal appears, at least from the side, as a more modest alteration, but it would still be a bulky and dominant addition when viewed from the road, detrimental to the character of the property.
8. Finally, the appellant contends that the roof alterations are necessary to create additional living space in the roof for the needs of a young family. I have much sympathy for this viewpoint, but I am not convinced that the current scheme is the only way to achieve that additional space, and it would, in its proposed form, be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Hardy Way. It would conflict with Policy CP30 of the Council's Core Strategy, and with Policy DMD37 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD), both of which relate to development achieving a high quality of design, respecting the character of the surrounding area. It would also conflict with Policy DMD13 of the DMD, which requires roof extensions to meet certain positional criteria, and to be in keeping with the character of the property and not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR