
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17th March 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3167097

13 Brantwood Gardens, Enfield, EN2 7LY.

- 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 A Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 16/04103/HOU, dated 3 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is formation of three gable dormers for loft rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for formation of three gable dormers for loft rooms, at 13 Brantwood Gardens, Enfield, EN2 7LY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/04103/HOU, dated 3 May 2016, 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 the following approved plans: HM Land Registry Site Location Plan 1:1250; Drawing No: DP/2772/PP/01: Existing Ground and First Floor Plan; Drawing No: DP/2772/PP/02: Existing and Proposed Loft Floor Layout (3 drawings); Drawing No: DP/2772/PP/03: Existing Front, Rear and Side Elevations; Drawing No: DP/2772/PP/04: Proposed Front, Rear and Side Elevations; Drawing No: DP/2772/PP/06: Section AA and BB.
 - 3) Samples or specifications of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the dormers hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before their use in the development. The development shall be implemented using the approved materials.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The Council say that the cheeks of the rear dormer would sit on the pitch of the roof and object to the minimal set up from the eaves level. However, only the
-

very uppermost edges on each side would intersect with the ridge and notwithstanding the minimal set up from eaves level, the dormer would plainly appear as a very much subordinate addition to the rear roof slope. Its narrow width would be a reflection of the narrow width of the apex of the rear roof slope and would not to my mind look out of place. Whilst I note that Policy DMD13 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (DMD) seeks to secure an inset from the ridges and eaves of the roof of between 500mm and 750mm, the use of the word *normally* clearly implies a degree of judgement in the use of this criterion, subject to the site context.

4. I accept the Council's point that side dormers are not a feature of the properties in the locality. However, in this case they would each be set well back from the main front elevation of the property, thus occupying a visually discrete position, would not be particularly wide and would appear as modest additions relative to the massing of the roof. They would also not look out of place in the context of the multiple roof forms of the host property with intersecting ridges at different levels. I thus do not accept they would appear as dominant or intrusive features.
5. I thus conclude on the main issue, that the proposed dormers would integrate satisfactorily with the appearance of the host dwelling and wider character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), Policy DMD13 of the DMD, or the guidance in the Framework, which seek to secure a high standard of design in new development, which is in keeping with the character of the property and not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area.

Other Matters

6. The occupiers of both adjoining houses to either side objected to the proposals in terms of loss of light to bathroom and landing windows (in terms of No 15 Brantwood Gardens) and loss of light in respect of a bathroom window and loss of privacy (in respect of No 11 Brantwood Gardens). However, as the dormers would be of limited width and set above the level of these windows, which do not serve habitable rooms, I do not consider the reduction in light would materially harm occupiers living conditions. Any views from the rear dormer would outlook primarily down the appellant's own garden and there would thus not be any appreciable loss of privacy to the occupants of No 11. Neither given its limited width and position set away from the boundary with that property, do I consider the rear dormer would give rise to any appreciable overshadowing.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement of development and a condition confining the approval to specified plans, the Council suggest a matching materials condition. A condition confining the approval to the submitted plans is necessary for clarity. I shall replace the matching materials condition (necessary to secure a satisfactory finish), with one requiring samples to be submitted for approval, as the standard condition could potentially allow either brick and/or tiles to be used.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR