
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3170137

23 Densworth Grove, Edmonton, London N9 0LJ

- 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 Loukas Costi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/05177/HOU, dated 8 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a roof alteration and loft conversion to create 2 additional habitable rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey semi-detached house which is located in a residential area of similar properties. The house has been extended in the past, which includes a 2 storey side extension. This extension has provided a hipped roof which matches the original roof style and others in the road, including the attached neighbour. The proposal is to provide a gable to the side and a rear dormer window spanning the great majority of the rear roof.
4. Policy DMD 13 of '*Enfield's Development Management Document*' adopted November 2014 refers to roof extensions. It states that such extensions must fulfil a number of criteria if they are to be accepted, these include: being of an appropriate size within the roof-plane, inset from the eaves, ridge and edges; not dominating the area and in keeping with it; side roof extensions must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or group.
5. The existing side extension is of a significant size and appears about as wide as the original house. One element which has enabled it to harmonise with the area, including the original pair of houses, is the provision of a hipped roof at the side. This matches the style of the other houses in the area. The proposal would replace this with a gable. I consider that this would have the effect of increasing the apparent bulk and mass of the existing roof considerably. Combined with the wide roof that covers the existing original house plus its

large extension, I consider that the proposal would have the effect of adding an unreasonable mass to the existing roof. As a result, it would appear dominating and out of place within this area and adjacent to its attached neighbour, wherein the modest hipped form of the roofs is not a dominant feature. I appreciate that the wider area may contain examples of roofs where the original hip has been extended to form a gable, but the situation in this appeal is where a large extended roof would be converted to a gable and I have judged, in this individual case, that the roof would be unduly large and have an unacceptable effect on the area.

6. The proposed rear dormer would occupy the great majority of the rear roof. I consider that its considerable size and the lack of any meaningful space around it would mean that it would appear unduly large and would have a detrimental impact on the area. I have considered the other cases referred to by the appellant but I have not been provided with full details of the planning history and relevant considerations for them. From the details submitted, it would appear that many were approved or built prior to the adoption of the Council's current policies. I would also add that some of the examples of large dormer windows referred to serve to reinforce my view that such forms of development can have a significantly detrimental effect on the character of an area and so do not serve as precedents for the current scheme.

Conclusions

7. I have taken account of all other matters raised by the appellant but I find that none is sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. As a result the proposal is contrary to Policies DMD 13 and DMD 17 and Policy CP 30 of the Core Strategy and there are no matters to outweigh these considerations. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR