
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2017

by J Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3172593
28A Derby Road, Enfield EN3 4AW

- 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 Kenan Ozdas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/00059/FUL, dated 31 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft extension to first floor flat.
-

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 building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Given the range of house types within the street, the style and design of roofs along Derby Road is varied and there are a number of properties in the locality which have roof extensions. However, as a two-storey end of terrace house now converted into 2 flats, the building has retained its original roof form and a sense of balance and symmetry with the neighbouring property at No 30.
 4. The proposed development includes two rooflights to the front roof slope, a full width dormer window on the main rear roof slope and a further dormer window on part of the two-storey outrigger's roof. The two dormers would necessitate raising of the end gable wall of the building. When viewed from the rear garden and the gardens and houses beyond, the dormers would form an L shape with the outrigger dormer lying at a slightly lower position than the dormer to the main roof.
 5. The two rear outriggers of the appeal site and No 30 are broadly symmetrical in terms of their form, with the existing pitched roof outriggers sitting comfortably at an angle to the main buildings. The proposed dormers would introduce a large, boxy addition which would significantly upset the balance identified above. This would harm the proportions of the existing building and confuse the orderly arrangement of the building's rear elevation.
 6. Policy DMD13 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (IEDMD) states that inset distances from the eaves, ridge and edges of
-

the roof are required. These insets should normally be between 500 – 750mm. Although the proposed dormer on the main roof is set down from the ridge and up from the eaves, the insets are not sufficient to reduce the dormer's dominance. Furthermore, the proposed dormer to the main roof spans the full width of the property and the proposed outrigger dormer is only slightly set up from the eaves. Both dormers also involve raising the gable end wall, which would intensify the overall effect of the proposed development on the host building.

7. Despite the use of matching materials, the dormers lack sufficient insets from the eaves, ridge and edges of the building's roof to either reduce the visual impact of the proposed development or be compliant with policy. They would form an unduly dominant and incongruous feature. Although views of the dormers from the street would be limited to views of the extended gable wall from Derby Road, they would be clearly visible from a number of neighbouring properties on Derby Road and Lincoln Road and their gardens. I consider therefore that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building and the area generally.
8. The appellant points to the significant alterations to the roof of No 24. The development at No 24 took place under permitted development, which is not applicable in this instance. The existence of other roof extensions in the locality and the potential for future roof extensions to vary in size do not justify the harm I have identified nor does the benefits of providing additional living space.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and policies DMD13 and DMD37 of the IEDMD. Policies CP30 and DMD37 both set out general design principles to improve the quality of Enfield's built and natural environment, while policy DMD13 establishes the Council's criteria for assessing roof extensions.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and taking account of other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gilbert

INSPECTOR