



---

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 July 2021

**by Mr James Blackwell LLB (Hons)**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 20 July 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3269836**

**78 Mandeville Road, Enfield EN3 6SJ**

- 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 Dervis Arslan against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref 20/03782/HOU, dated 16 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2021.
  - The development proposed is retrospective planning for loft element.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the planning application, the 2016 iteration of the London Plan has been superseded. Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the 2016 plan were cited in the Council's reason for refusal, however the content of these policies which is relevant to the main issue in this appeal has been replaced by Policy D3 of the 2021 version<sup>1</sup>. The main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the changes. I have determined this appeal with regard to the most up to date development plan.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The roof of the property has previously been converted to accommodate a first floor, which incorporates 2 dormers at the front. Given the pre-existing roof pitch and fenestration arrangement, the dwelling's frontage has a strong symmetrical quality which contributes positively to its appearance. The wider road is predominantly residential in nature and comprises a mixture of house types.
5. The development has raised the sides of the rear roof plane to create a further dormer type extension. It extends across the full width of the building and runs off the eaves. The height matches the existing ridge height of the property. At the rear, this design means the dwelling looks entirely like a 2-storey property, and no longer retains any characteristics of a bungalow. At the front, whilst the dwelling does retain the appearance of a bungalow in part, the top corners of

---

<sup>1</sup> The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021 (London Plan (2021))

the rear dormer protrude either side from the main pitch of the roof. This gives the dwelling a stepped appearance, with the front of the dwelling appearing significantly smaller than its rear. The imbalance between the front and the rear of the property means the rear extension appears bulky and dominant (particularly given its former bungalow characteristics).

6. In addition, the depth of the development extends further along the northern pitch of the roof towards the front of the dwelling than it does on the southern side of the property. This creates another imbalance between the two sides of the property, which detracts from the symmetry of the appeal dwelling's frontage.
7. For these reasons, the development harms the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 – 2025 (2010) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which require development to achieve high quality design which is appropriate to its context and surroundings. The development also conflicts with Policies DMD13 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document (2014), which require, in the interests of good quality and contextually appropriate design, roof extensions to integrate within the existing roof plane, and where rear dormers are proposed, these should be inset adequately from the eaves, ridge and edges of the existing roof. Finally, the development conflicts with the overarching design objectives of the Framework, which require development to achieve high quality design which integrates well with its surroundings.

### **Other Matters**

8. The appellant has provided a number of examples of recent Council approvals for loft conversions near to the appeal property, as well as some photographs of similar alterations. Whilst these help demonstrate that loft conversions and rear dormers can be acceptable in the area, the examples are generally more consistent with development plan requirements. As such, they integrate more successfully with their host dwelling and the street scene. My findings do not therefore change.
9. The appeal property is not listed, has no heritage value and is not in a conservation area. Irrespective of these factors, development can still harm the character of an area, and indeed does so in this case. The appellant also contends that the main material consideration in assessing a rear roof extension is whether the proposal would have a harmful impact on neighbouring amenity. This is not accurate. Whilst such impact will be a key factor in the determination of an application, impact on character and appearance plays an equal role and in any event forms the main issue of the case before me.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*James Blackwell*

INSPECTOR