



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3251607
34A Windsor Road, London N13 5PR

- 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 Kola Andoyi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00033/FUL, dated 22 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer with front rooflights and Juliet balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has not raised concerns over the proposed front rooflights, and from my visit and the evidence before me I see no reason to take a different view. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons

3. The generally consistent size, style and appearance of the semi-detached and terraced buildings which characterise Windsor Road results in a distinctive rhythm and attractive sense of unity to the street scene. Two-storey outrigger projections set below the main roof level are common to the rear of many of the buildings, and together with the limited examples of visible extensions and alterations to their upper parts, this contributes a similar degree of coherence at the rear of the buildings.
4. The proposed dormer would be set in from the gable to the side of the semi-detached appeal building, and set down from the main roof ridge. However, the insets would only be by around 500mm which is the minimum of the range advised by Policy DMD 13 of Enfield's Development Management Document 2014 (DMD), and there would be no discernible inset from the boundary with the attached neighbour. As a result, the dormer would occupy much of the width of the rear roofslope, and it would also extend beyond the rear of the main roof over the outrigger.
5. The resulting scale and bulk of the development would substantially alter and dominate the profile of the host roofslope. Moreover, the rear section of the dormer over the outrigger would project conspicuously above the height of this part of the building. As a consequence, it would be a jarring and awkward

addition which would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the host building. The development would also disrupt the regular pattern of the established roofline to the rear of Windsor Road which is a distinctive element of the area's character. Although views from the street scene would be limited, the visual impact of the proposal would nevertheless be intrusive and prominent when seen from the surrounding buildings and gardens.

6. I acknowledge that there is a similar dormer to the rear of 22A Osborne Road which is partly visible from the appeal site. However, in my view, this example illustrates the incongruous nature and adverse visual impact of dormer alterations extending above outrigger roofslopes, and I do not therefore consider it a reason to allow development which would further harm the character of the area. Moreover, although nearby, it is not a feature of the roofline to this part of Windsor Road where I noted few other dormers, and where those that I was able to see either did not extend onto outrigger roofslopes, or, included set down rear sections. These factors limit the weight that I afford to this other development in support of the appeal proposal.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and area. As a consequence, it would conflict with requirements within Policy DMD 13 of the DMD that roof alterations are of an appropriate size and in keeping with the character of the property. It would also conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010, policies DMD 8 and DMD 37 of the DMD and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. Together, these policies broadly seek development which is appropriate to its context and which reinforces local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

8. I appreciate that the appellant has made changes in response to advice provided by the Council following refusal of an earlier application, but this is not a factor which alters my conclusions on the planning merits of the proposal. I also note the appellant's assertion that the development would comprise permitted development if the appeal building was a single dwelling. However, it is not, and I have considered the proposal on its merits with regard to relevant policies of the development plan.

Conclusion

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

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR