The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3257877
150 Wellington Road, Enfield, EN1 2RH

- 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 Mrs Gilbert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application Ref 20/01486/HOU, dated 11 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2020.
- The development proposed is extension to roof to form part gable end to provide additional rear dormer and front rooflights.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to roof to form part gable end to provide additional rear dormer and front rooflights at 150 Wellington Road, Enfield, EN1 2RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01486/HOU, dated 11 May 2020, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

    3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 20/486/10; 20/486.11A; 20/486.12A; 20/486.13A; 20/486.14A; 20/486.16A; 20/486.17A; 20/486.18A; 20/486.19A; 20/486.20.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

3. The Council's reason for refusing the application refers to policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which relate to the quality of design and its contribution to local character. That plan has since been superseded by the London Plan 2021 (LP) which was published in March 2021. Policy D3 of the LP sets similar requirements for development with respect to the quality of design and how it responds to the local character. I have therefore determined the

appeal with regard to policy D3 and am satisfied that neither party will be caused an injustice by taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to a single storey house which is one of three houses on Wellington Road between the junctions with Gardenia Road and Manorway. They share a similar design with houses on Manorway. The key characteristics of which are their curved bay windows on the front elevations either side of centrally located front doors. Pitched roof gables extend from the roof at eaves level to just below the roof ridge above one of the bay windows on each house. Many of these front facing gables contain a window and mock Tudor vertical boards.

6. Most of the houses are semi-detached. The front facing gables are at either end of each pair of houses thus providing an element of symmetry. This is the case with the neighbouring houses, Nos 152 and 154, which as a result appear as a pair of dwellings. The appeal property is joined to No 152 by a single storey side wing and therefore forms part of a terrace of three houses. However, its appearance is that of a separate house. This is because of the gap between its main roof and that of No 152 created by the flat roof side wing. Consequently, it does not appear as part of a coherent trio with its neighbours as the Council suggest.

7. The existing building's roof is half hipped on one side and fully hipped on the other where it extends down from the front gable roof ridge to the flat roofed wing. The proposal would extend the roof over the side wing creating a half-hipped roof to match the opposite side. It would provide an element of symmetry and balance to the building. Although the eaves of the proposed roof would meet that of the neighbouring house, its design would be different and maintain a gap between the main part of their roofs. As a result, the appeal property would still appear as a separate dwelling rather than the proposal creating a continuous façade and terracing effect which policy DMD14 of the Enfield Development Management Document (November 2014) (DMD) seeks to avoid.

8. The proposal would include an additional rear dormer. The appeal property and adjoining properties have rear dormers of varying sizes and designs. Their rear roof scape has therefore already been significantly altered. Although the Council accepts that an additional dormer would be acceptable in principle, it considers the proposed development would be incongruous and bulky. The proposal does not meet the normal eaves and ridge inset requirements of policy DMD 13 of the DMD. However, it would match that of the existing dormer as would its design although it would not be as wide. Therefore, in my view it would be an appropriate size, and location within the roof plane, as required by policy DMD 13.

9. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would not affect features that are characteristic of buildings within the area and would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. There would be no

conflict with policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (November 2010), Policies DMD8, DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the DMD, LP policy D3 and the Framework which required high quality development of an appropriate scale that complements local character.

Conditions

10. The 3 year period in which the planning permission may be implemented is a statutory requirement. Conditions should also be imposed to require the use of matching materials in the interests of appearance and to list the plans in the interest of certainty.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR