



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2017

by Helen Heward BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3181247

Flat B, 24 Upsdell Avenue, Southgate, London, N13 6JN

- 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 Celal Ince against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/01438/FUL, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a "*Loft Conversion with Full Width Dormer & 3 Roof Lights to front. First Floor Rear Extension*".
-

Procedural Matters

1. I have used the description given on the application form, but note that the Council describe the proposal as comprising "*an extension to roof at side to form gable end with rear dormer and front rooflights, together with first floor rear extension*".

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair it is a part of, and the locality.

Reasons

4. Flat 2 is a part of No 24. No's 24 and 22 are a pair of semi-detached properties. From the street they appear to have retained many original features, including a simple hipped roof that has a pleasant symmetrical and unifying effect. I found the locality to be predominantly characterised by semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs.
 5. The proposed gable would disrupt this symmetry and unbalance the appearance of the roof over the two properties. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the pair and the locality.
 6. The appellant informs me that the majority of loft conversions have been done without the attached property converting the loft, and that out of 18 loft conversions in the street only 2 sets of semi-detached properties have both had a loft conversion. I did see some semi-detached properties where one had had a roof alteration and the other retains a hip and I noted the two gables at
-

the adjacent pair of properties. However, I found that most pairs of dwellings still appear to have hipped roofs when viewed from the street.

7. The first floor rear extension would have its own roof. Occupying almost the full width of the roof slope, the large flat roof dormer would appear as an additional element, quite separate from both the main roof and the first floor extension. Overall the extensions would appear as a set of extensions. The scale and visual separateness of the elements would lack cohesion and appear quite unrelated to the original form and character of this dwelling and the pair of semi-detached dwellings that it is part of.
8. The proposals have been designed to reflect similar existing first floor and flat roof dormer extensions at the rear of neighbouring properties No's 26 and 28. However, that does not mitigate the impact of the proposals upon this pair of semi-detached dwellings.
9. I conclude that the proposed extensions would be detrimental to the character and appearance of No 24 and No 22 and to the locality. Therefore, I find that the proposals are contrary to Policy DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (the DPD). Amongst other things, this policy requires that roof extensions to residential properties must be of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane, in keeping with the character of the property and not disrupt the character and balance of the pair of properties.

Other Matters

10. A submission has been made that the development is needed for personal circumstances. However, there is insufficient evidence for me to assess this matter and therefore I cannot attach any significant weight to it.
11. The second reason for refusal refers to Policy DMD11. This is mainly concerned with effects upon living conditions. I have confined my consideration to the reasons for refusal, and these do not refer to living conditions.
12. The actions of the Council during the consideration of the application are matters that should be addressed through the Council's complaints procedure and are not matters to be addressed in this appeal.
13. The opinions of an individual planning officer are referred to but I have confined my considerations to the decision made by the Council.
14. I have attached little weight to speculations about the permitted development rights that No 22 may benefit from and possible future extensions and alterations to that property. I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given, and having taken all other matters raised into consideration, the appeal is dismissed.

Helen Heward

PLANNING INSPECTOR