
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3259717
26 Mayfair Terrace, Southgate N14 6HJ

- 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 Laura Vaz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01369/HOU, dated 3 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is an extension to roof at side to form gable end and rear dormer with Juliette balcony and 3 x front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to roof at side to form gable end and rear dormer with Juliette balcony and 3 x front rooflights at 26 Mayfair Terrace, Southgate N14 6HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01369/HOU, dated 3 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1245/01; 1245/02; 1245/03; 1245/04; 1245/05 and 1245/06.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. For reasons of clarity, the description of development has been adopted from the appeal form and the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an extended 2-storey end of terrace dwelling located within a primarily residential area. The terrace comprises 3 dwellings. The other end property has noticeably higher eaves and ridge heights than the

other 2 dwellings within the terrace. There is an access to the side of the property creating a gap in the street frontage.

5. A number of the semi-detached dwellings fronting Mayfair Terrace have been altered, including by hip to gable roof extensions and the erection of rear dormers with rooflights within the front roofslopes. Whether or not these alterations were undertaken as permitted development or with the benefit of planning permission, the gable roofs of these dwellings contribute to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
6. A Lawful Development Certificate has been issued by the Council for alterations of the property comprising a hip to gable roof extension and the erection of a rear dormer as permitted development (Ref 18/00474/CEA). This is a material consideration which is given significant weight as a fallback position in the determination of this appeal. However, the appellant is seeking a larger rear dormer to provide additional accommodation within the roofspace. When compared to the fallback position, this increase in size would be achieved by reducing some of the inset distances of the proposed dormer from the edges of the enlarged roofslope.
7. Policy DMD 13 of Enfield's Development Management Document (DMD) refers to roof extensions being of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane and for roof dormers to be inset from the eaves, ridge and edges of the roof. Rather than being an absolute requirement, reference is made to such insets normally being between 500-750mm. Any roof extensions should also be in keeping with the character of the property and not be a dominant addition when viewed from the surrounding area.
8. Although there would be some setting back from the edge of the enlarged roofslope, the proposed dormer would not achieve the normal inset distances sought by DMD Policy DMD 13. However, when assessed against the context of the fallback position, together with the adjoining and surrounding rear roof extensions, the proposed dormer would not be a visually or physically overly dominant addition which would be harmful to the character and appearance of either this already altered property or the surrounding area.
9. By reason of the terrace's inconsistent ridge and eaves height, the proposed hip to gable roof extension would neither materially disrupt the symmetry of the terrace nor cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Hip to gable roof extensions are a common feature of other dwellings along Mayfair Terrace and, as such, this element of the appeal scheme would not be a discordant or incongruous form of development within the streetscene. Further, the fallback position allows for a hip to gable roof extension.
10. To assist with the assimilation of the proposed development into the streetscene and surrounding area, it would be appropriate for the external materials to match the host property and this could be secured by a suitable condition.
11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the streetscene, and, as such, it would not conflict with DMD Policies DMD13 and DMD37, Policy 30 of Enfield's Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. In addition to

roof extensions, these policies are concerned with improving the quality of the built environment, including by reference to taking into account the nature of the surrounding area and promoting high quality development of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing. DMD Policy DMD8 is not of direct relevance to the appeal scheme because it concerns new residential development rather than alterations to a dwelling.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of clarity, a condition is necessary to ensure the proposed development is erected in accordance with the submitted drawings. For the reasons given, a condition to require external materials to match the host property is also necessary. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR