



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/16/3158646

42 Aylands Road, Enfield EN3 6PN

- 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 Dalton Ayton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/02976/HOU, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer and three roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey hipped roofed end of terrace dwelling located on a residential street containing dwellings of a similar scale and design. The dwelling has previously been extended to the side and rear and has a part single storey, part two storey hipped roofed side extension positioned very close to the common side boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at 44 Aylands Road. The first floor of the side extension is set back from the original front elevation of the host building. An existing two storey side extension at No 44 with no set back at first floor is also sited adjacent to the common side boundary. The host building has a long rear garden meaning that its rear elevation is not prominent and there are numerous examples of rear dormers in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
4. The proposal would result in the loss of the existing hipped roofs to the front elevation of the host building, a characteristic feature of the surrounding area. The proposed gable roof would extend across the entire width of the extended dwelling, would overhang the existing subservient side extension and would significantly reduce the visual gap between the host building and No 44. Though there are some other examples of gabled roofs nearby, these are not generally characteristic of the area, are not as large and wide as the roof proposed and larger gaps exist between these other extended dwellings and their neighbours. Consequently the hip to gable roof extension proposed by reason of its design, size and siting would be an overly dominant and obtrusive

addition to the host building which would be out of character and incongruous with it and the surrounding area.

5. As stated there are a number of examples of rear dormers in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. However none appear to be as large as the one proposed which would extend across almost the entire width of the extended dwelling. In addition whilst it would be set up from the eaves and set in from the sides of the roof of the dwelling, it would be sited very close to the ridge of the roof. Consequently due to its design and excessive size, the dormer would be dominant and obtrusive and would fail to integrate with the character and appearance of the host building. Whilst its position at the rear of the appeal site means that it would not be prominent and whilst it would be set behind the hipped roof of the existing two storey rear extension, it would nevertheless be harmful to the host building.
6. The Council raised no objections to the proposed rooflights which also form part of the proposal. Whilst I have no reason to disagree with the Council on this issue, the rooflights form an integral part of the proposal and are not therefore a severable element capable of being considered independently.
7. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policies DMD13 and DMD37 of Enfield's Development Management Document, Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy and policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. These policies seek, amongst other things, high quality design and development, including roof extensions, to be of an appropriate size and location and to have regard to its context.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR