
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2017

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3176177
677 Hertford Road, Enfield EN3 6NH

- 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 Ms A Aysel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/00590/HOU, dated 8 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is alterations to roof for part of gable hip wall with rear dormer and two roof windows to front side including external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. The property is located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached properties. The appeal property is one of a number of similar dwellings with distinctive hipped roofs in the locality.
 4. The proposal would entail the construction of a dutch gable roof extension across the side roof plane of the house. A flat roof dormer extension is proposed at the rear of the house that would be inset from the eaves, ridge and the shared party wall with the adjoining property. Two new rooflights are also proposed at the front of the property.
 5. Policy DMD13 of the Council's Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) states that roof extensions to the side of a property must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or the part of properties of which the dwelling forms a part. In the case of roof dormers they should be of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane, inset from the eaves, ridge and the edge of the roof by between 500-750mm.
 6. The proposed side roof extension, by virtue of its siting and design, would be a significant addition relative to the main house and would result in substantial
-

bulk at this side of the dwelling. The design and the appearance of the proposed dutch gable roof would be very much at odds with the roof design of the host property and the more traditional hipped roofs of similar properties in the area. The proposed rear dormer, whilst complying with the inset requirements of DMD Policy DMD13, when combined with the proposed dutch gable roof extension, results in the proposed development overwhelming the form of the original dwelling. The proposed side roof extension and rear dormer would significantly detract from the form of the main house and would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property.

7. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the side extension's prominent position, which is visible from a number of public vantage points along Hertford Road. As such I consider that the side roof extension and rear dormer would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that, by virtue of their siting and design, would cause unacceptable harm to the architectural integrity of the original building and the character and appearance of the area.
8. I have considered the appellant's statement that the design of the proposal has been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and the area and to minimise any impacts on occupiers of the adjacent dwellings. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposed side roof extension and rear dormer with the host property, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above. I therefore accord these matters limited weight.
9. I have noted the extensions in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. The side extension to the roof and the rear roof dormer allowed on appeal at 4a Charter Way¹ have different development and locational characteristics and was allowed in a different policy context to the appeal scheme. I therefore accord this limited weight as a precedent in this case.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with the design aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy and DMD Policies DMD13 and DMD37. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development, including roof extensions, demonstrates a high quality design that is in keeping with the character of the property, respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and is not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area. In addition, it would not accord with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework that development should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 17); to respect the local character (paragraph 58); and to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness (paragraph 60).

Conclusion

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Q5300/D/12/2178066