



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: 20 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3262065
84A Fernleigh Road, London, N21 3AH

- 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 James Watters against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01129/FUL, dated 6 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is Hip to gable roof conversion and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for hip to gable roof conversion and rear dormer extension at 84A Fernleigh Road, London, N21 3AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01129/FUL, dated 6 April 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: 1615/P01; 1615/P02; 1615/P20; 1615/P21; 1615/P22; 1615/P23.
 - 4) The proposed roof level window in the gable end/eastern flank elevation wall of the building as shown on Dwg No. 1615/P22 shall be finished in obscure glazing and non-opening below 1.7m in the relevant room in which it is to be installed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's reasons for refusing the application refers to policies 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 That plan has since been superseded by the London Plan 2021 (LP) which was published in March 2021.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 of the LP and am satisfied that neither party will be caused an injustice by taking this approach.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a first floor flat in a semi-detached residential property. It is located in a residential street comprising a variety of designs of mainly semi-detached houses. The host building has a hipped roof, as does the adjoining house, but has a lower roof ridge.
5. The Council acknowledge that hip to gable extensions is a feature of properties within the street and are not necessarily harmful to the street scene. However, the Council is concerned that in combination with the rear dormer it would appear obtrusive and dominant.
6. The appellant's Design and Access Statement Addendum contains many examples of rear dormers on houses in Fernleigh Road. Also, rear dormers of varying sizes are visible from the rear garden of the property and on houses on the adjoining Hoppers Road and Arundel Gardens to the rear. The roof scape of the surrounding area has been substantially altered over time and has, as a result, a varied appearance.
7. I accept that the proposed development would interrupt the current symmetry that the pair of dwellings have, and lead to a substantial change to the original roof form. Also, the proposed dormer would not meet the normal inset requirements with regard to the ridge and new gable end as set out in Policy DMD 13 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (DMD). Nevertheless, it would be set below the ridge, up from the eaves, and in from the side where the roof joins the neighbouring property. Also, several other extensions in the vicinity were similarly flush with the gable end, rather than set in from it.
8. Therefore, in the context of the area's varied roofscape, the proposed development would not be out of character. It would share a similar design, scale, and position within the roof plane as other extensions within the area rather than appearing overly bulky or visually obtrusive. In this regard it would meet the requirements of policy DMD 13. Furthermore, the Juliet balcony windows do not cover the same width as the first floor bay windows and, in combination with the smaller ensuite bathroom window, do not dominate compared to windows on other floors, as the Council suggest.
9. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would be acceptable and would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. The proposal would not, therefore, conflict with the aims of policy DMD 13 and DMD37 of the DMD, policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010, policy D3 of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which seek to achieve high quality development of an appropriate scale and form that has regard to its surroundings. Policies CP4 and DMD 8 referred to in the Council's reason for refusal relate to new residential development and are not therefore relevant to the proposal.

Other Matters

10. Third party concerns relate to overlooking, overshadowing, parking provision, bins, noise, and disturbance. I have had regard to these matters and conclude that either no harm would occur, or that based on the evidence before me the level of harm would not be significant enough to warrant withholding planning permission.

Conditions

11. 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. The Council's suggested condition for the proposed side window to be obscurely glazed is necessary to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR