
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3260101
54 Park Drive, Southgate N21 2LS

- 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 Athanasi Christodoulou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01897/HOU, dated 22 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer with doors and balustrades.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property, including a Certificate of Lawfulness issued for the conversion of the existing roof to form a hip to gable roof extension on the side and front rooflights in 2017¹. At the time of my site visit, I observed that the gabled roof extension permitted under the Certificate of Lawfulness had been completed.
3. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached extended dwelling located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by semi-detached properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. The surrounding semi-detached properties are of comparable scale and form, with distinctive double projecting gabled front bay windows and traditional hipped and gabled tiled roofs.

¹ 17/00969/CEA

6. The proposal involves the construction of a rear roof dormer extension across the full width of the recently extended gabled roof to create additional living accommodation in the loft space. The rear flat roof dormer extension would be inset from the edges and eaves of the roof and set down below the ridge line of the host property.
7. Although the proposed extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size, the scale and form of the proposed flat roofed dormer extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. Although set in and set down, the proposed rear dormer extension would result in substantial bulk being added to the roof plane with only very narrow peripheral parts of the sloping roof being evident.
8. The consequential harm would not in my view be sufficiently resolved by the limited effect of the proposed rear dormer extension on the street scene. In any case, the proposal would be visible at the rear from the surrounding properties. I therefore consider that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed rear dormer extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
9. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed rear dormer extension has been carefully considered in order to minimise any impacts on the host property and the area. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above. As such, I consider that the development would adversely harm rather than positively contribute to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to the overall aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 and Policies DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development and roof extensions demonstrate a high quality design, that is in keeping with the character of the property, appropriate to its context and the local character of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. Whilst I note some parallel and use of rear dormers on gabled roofs, the various roof alterations and extensions to the properties in the surrounding area relate to a different scale and form of development to the appeal scheme. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and I am unaware of the full circumstances associated with these other cases. I therefore accord them limited weight as precedents in this case.
12. I have considered the appellant's comments regarding the consultation with neighbours and the lack of formal objections from the neighbours or third

parties to the appeal proposal. Whilst this maybe so, this does not preclude the proper planning assessment of the impact of the proposal on the host property and the area and is not a determinative factor on its own.

13. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design, contributing to the larger housing stock in the area and providing additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR