
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 December 2020

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3259053
78 Picketts Lock Lane, Edmonton N9 0AX

- 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 Erdal Akca against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01955/HOU, dated 25 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a rear dormer and three roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced dwelling in a residential cul-de-sac. Like some properties close to the site, No 78 has been externally altered and extended. Specifically, at the rear of the dwelling there is a 2-storey extension with a hipped roof and a flat roof ground floor addition with an attached canopy that extends across almost the full width of the host building.
4. The proposal is to erect a new dormer on the main rear roof slope. The new addition would be inset from the eaves, ridge and edges of the host roof in line with the requirements of Policy DMD 13 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD). Nevertheless, the proposal would still be a sizeable addition covering the majority of the main rear roof slope. One side of the new dormer would be cut into the hipped roof of the existing 2-storey rear projection. This arrangement would result in an incongruous detail where part of the proposal would appear to have been truncated to fit the space available. While this would make efficient use of the roof space, the visual effect would be contrived and unconvincing because the new dormer would appear overly wide and ill fitting on the main rear roof.
5. When seen together with the existing extensions at the rear of the appeal property, which vary in roof type and depth from the main wall, the proposal would add to the cumbersome enlargement of the appeal dwelling. In the light of the cumulative impact on the appeal dwelling, the proposed dormer would form an unwieldy feature in the new rear elevation. This impression would be

most pronounced from the service track just beyond the rear of the site, the back gardens of neighbouring properties and along Pickett Lock Lane. From each of these locations, the proposal would draw the eye as an overly dominant, uncharacteristically large and poorly fitting structure. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the use of external materials to match those of the existing dwelling.

6. I acknowledge that rear dormers alongside existing 2-storey rear extensions are a familiar feature of many properties throughout the Borough. However, in this case, the new dormer would be the only such feature within the terrace to which No 78 belongs. Consequently, it would be obtrusive. In any event, it is a central principle of the planning system that every development should be considered on its own merits. Having done so, my own conclusion is that the proposed change at the rear would be on a scale where the form of the host building would be unduly compromised and there would be a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area.
7. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed dormer would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it is contrary to Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025, DMD Policies DMD 13 and DMD 37 and Policy 7.4 of The London Plan. Together, these policies aim to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design quality, is appropriate to its context, and that roof extensions are in keeping with the character of the property.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR