



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3275981

115 Crofton Way, Enfield, EN2 8HR

- 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 & Mrs Pavel Pavlov against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield
 - The application Ref 21/00299/HOU, dated 28 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer with front rooflight involving increase in roof height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of the proposed development on the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposal.
3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). However, the policies that are relevant to this appeal have not changed and there was no need, therefore, to invite the parties to make further submissions in response.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a cul-de-sac that forms part of a wider housing estate and comprises a two storey property that is part of a terrace of four similar properties. Similar terraces are to be found throughout the estate together with some three storey buildings, which appear to be occupied as flats. The estate has a formal, but pleasant layout, with well landscaped communal areas.
6. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a rear dormer across the full width of the main roof to the host property. The proposed dormer would sit marginally above the existing eaves, but would extend above the height of the existing ridge. There are no roof extensions on any of the properties that form part of the same terrace as the host property and this whole roofscape remains, therefore, relatively uniform. Also, as the land slopes down, from

east to west, the ridge lines of the properties within the terrace also step down to reflect the change in levels. This detail is repeated on other terraces and is a positive feature of the estates original design.

7. Within that context, the size, scale and siting of the proposed dormer would, in my judgement, be excessive. It would occupy the majority of the rear roof plane to the host property and extend above the existing ridge. The proposal would represent an incongruous addition that would disrupt the rhythm of the existing roofscape. It would not be subordinate and neither would it be proportionate to either the host property or the wider terrace. As I also observed on my site visit, due to the changing ground levels and as the terrace, that includes the appeal site, is at right angles to Crofton Way, the rear roofscape is highly visible from public vantagepoints, from where the appeal proposal would visually dominate its surroundings.
8. The above findings are supported by policy DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (EDMD). This policy states that roof extensions will be permitted where various criteria are met. In this particular case, the size of the appeal proposal would be inappropriate; whilst the proposal would be marginally above the existing eaves it would not be inset from the existing ridge or common boundaries; it would not be in keeping with the character of the host property or terrace and would be visually dominant when viewed from the surrounding area. The appeal proposal would not, therefore, comply with the criteria to policy DMD13 or the policy itself.
9. The Appellant contends that if proposed dormer was designed not to exceed the existing ridge, then it would constitute permitted development. Whether that is the case or not, is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Planning Act. I can only determine the proposal that is before me, which is for a rear dormer extension.
10. The Council state that the only property in the surrounding area with a similar roof extension is 105 Crofton Way, but that planning permission for this development pre-dates current local plan policies and that this case is not, therefore, relevant to this appeal. That statement has not been challenged and I concur with the Council's views in this respect.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposed rear dormer would be contrary to policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010, policies DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the EDMD, and paragraph 130 of the Framework (previously paragraph 127). These policies seek, amongst other requirements, to maintain and improve the quality of the built environment, secure a high quality of design and ensure that development is of an appropriate scale, location and massing, is in keeping with local character and does not visually dominate its surroundings.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR