

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3239320

132, Flat 3, Palmerston Road, Southgate N22 8RD

- 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 Ian Cole against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/01032/FUL, dated 17 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as rear and outrigger dormers with front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading has been taken from the planning application form. Part E of the appeal form states that the description of development has not changed, even though an alternative description has been entered. This matches the description of development on the decision notice. As the appellant is in agreement with the text used by the Council on the decision notice and given the Council's approach in their determination of the planning application, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the following description of development: "rear dormer with front rooflights."

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular reference to the host building and wider terrace.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced residential dwelling, with a shallow two storey outrigger extension to the rear. The property has previously been converted into flats. The appeal proposal would result in the addition of rooflights and a box style dormer roof extension to the rear slope of the main roof of the property to facilitate the creation of additional accommodation.
5. Policy DMD13 of the Development Management Document (DMD) relates to roof extensions and sets out specific requirements for the inset of dormers from the eaves, ridge and edges of the roof that should "normally be between 500-750mm".

6. The proposed dormer roof extension is shown on the submitted plans as occupying almost the full extent of the rear roof plane, with a minimal gap from the ridge line and eaves. The dormer is shown as being almost flush with the roof of the adjoining properties with a small gap to the edge of the roof. These insets are substantially smaller than those required by Policy DMD13 of the DMD.
7. Furthermore, while the elevation of the dormer accommodates two windows, these windows are not of a similar size and style to the existing windows found elsewhere in the property that have a clear vertical emphasis and the remainder of the proposed extension would be an expanse of roof tiles. I note that the materials to be used could match the existing roof, but the proposed roof extension would nonetheless be of a significant mass dominating the original building. The result would be a visual appearance at odds with the traditional character of the host property.
8. In support of the appeal the appellant has asserted that the proposed development is necessary to modernise, adapt, enlarge and extend the life of the building and thus contribute to sustainable development. However, no substantive evidence has been presented to support this assertion in particular that such works are necessary and that the proposed development is the only development that can realise these objectives.
9. I saw at my site visit that the proposed dormer is situated to the rear of the dwelling and as such is not as prominent as it would be were it to be erected on the front elevation. Nonetheless, I saw that the proposed dormer would be visible from a number of viewpoints, including neighbouring gardens and dwellings and from a small part of Kelvin Avenue.
10. Consequently, on the basis of the evidence before me I find that the proposed rear dormer would be an incongruous feature in the area harming the character and appearance of the area, including the host property. Therefore, the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of Policies DMD13 and DMD37 of the DMD and Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) that amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

11. My attention has been drawn to two appeal decisions¹ and two applications² relating to sites elsewhere in London. However, I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, including in respect of scale, size, design and development plan policy. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/G5180/D/15/3006276; APP/N5090/D/11/2160760;

² 2014/1774 (Hackney); PP/2012/5136 (Ealing)