



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3242859

54 Macleod Road, Southgate N21 1SN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andy Lancaster against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 19/02947/HOU, dated 20 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is raise the height of the ridge and create a loft conversion with rear dormer. Openings to be created in the front slope to accommodate 2 no. Velux and 2 openings to be created in the rear dormer to accept 2 UPVC windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raise the height of the ridge and create a loft conversion with rear dormer. Openings to be created in the front slope to accommodate 2 no. Velux and 2 openings to be created in the rear dormer to accept 2 UPVC windows. At 54 Macleod Road, Southgate N21 1SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/02947/HOU, dated 20 August 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: Location Plan; 421 02 Revision A Existing Elevations and Section; 421 03 Proposed Plans & Elevations; 421 04 Revision A Proposed Elevations and Section.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwelling. It is located within a row of similar properties, towards the head of a residential cul-de-sac. The area is characterised by a mix of modern semi-detached and terraced dwellings with

gardens. From what I saw during my site visit, the host row is free from rear dormer extensions, although one is visible on a neighbouring property to the rear. Overall, the sloping topography, and variety of house styles and detailing together result in a noticeable variety of roof ridge and eaves heights, and built profiles in the neighbourhood.

4. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation at the appeal property. It is proposed to raise the roof ridge by 0.6m, to accommodate the dormer window to the rear roofslope. The proposed dormer would be towards the larger end of the scale and have some bulk. However, the somewhat sloping terrain in the vicinity of the appeal property, the varying step up and down of fence, hedge and roof lines, and intervening buildings and trees would, together, substantially divert the eye from, and limit the visibility of the proposal within the neighbourhood.
5. Whilst the fenestration of the proposed dormer would not align exactly with that of the existing rear elevation, it would not appear discordant. The proposed material matching with the host building's UPVC frames and concrete roof tiles, which will be secured by planning condition, will help the proposal to assimilate into its context.
6. At 0.5m up from the eaves and 0.5m in from the flank walls, the majority of the proposed dormer's inset distances would fall within the 'normally' allowable tolerances in paragraph 1a) of Policy DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (DMD). Whilst the 0.2m inset from the ridge would fall outside these tolerances, the limited visibility of this at the rear of the property, and the in-totality effect of the insets is such that the proposal would not be dominant when viewed from the surrounding area. Taking the above together, I find that the proposal would satisfy Policy DMD13's requirement to not be dominant, viewed from the surrounding area.
7. The proposed front rooflights are modest in scale, and the varied roof lines and detailing of the dwellings would draw the eye sufficiently to avoid visual harm in the streetscene.
8. I appreciate the Council's wish to achieve architectural rhythm and proportionality. However, in this case, I consider that the architectural and topographical variety of the context would help the proposal to assimilate acceptably.
9. In conclusion, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, including the host building. As such, it would not conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), Policy DMD37 of the DMD and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016)¹. The proposal would partially accord with Policy DM13 of the DMD, in respect of dominance. Together the policies seek to ensure that development complements local character.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved

¹ The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2011, March 2016.

plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition covering materials is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR