



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3292469

12 Haddon Close, Enfield EN1 1ET

- 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 Jackqueline Harris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/04219/HOU dated 7 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2022.
 - The development proposed comprises increasing roof height, together with extension to roof at side to form gable end with rear dormer, Juliette balcony and front rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for increasing roof height, together with extension to roof at side to form gable end with rear dormer, Juliette balcony and front rooflight at 12 Haddon Close, Enfield EN1 1ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04219/HOU dated 7 November 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of the development, I consider the revised description to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal, accordingly I have adopted the amended descriptions in the heading above.
3. At the time of my site visit, the development was in place. The application form made clear that the scheme had been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
4. The Council confirm that the proposed plans detail two front rooflights, however only one is present on the property and made their assessment on the basis of the 'as built' development. I also noted that the rear dormer attaches to the adjacent dormer rather than being inset as shown on the plans. Despite this the proposal is retrospective and the discrepancies are minor, no party has been prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of area and the property itself.

Reasons

6. The site is within a predominantly residential area and comprises an end terraced property. The terraced block of 6 properties is opposite a similar terraced block within a cul-de-sac. Whilst there are some properties in the area which have been altered there is an architectural rhythm to the built form.
7. Both blocks have end terraced properties with hipped roof features. Notwithstanding this I observed during my site visit that due to the amount of properties in the terrace and the public viewing opportunities towards the blocks the hip to gable does not unbalance the block. The proposed gable roof would not be an incongruous feature within the streetscene, the symmetry the hip roof provided does not contribute to the character of the area.
8. The rear dormer is large, covering the majority of the rear roof plane, Policy DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) requires roof dormers to be inset from the eaves, ridges and edges of the roof. The proposed dormer does not adhere to the policy requirements.
9. Notwithstanding this I observed during my site visit that two properties in the terrace block adjacent the appeal site (No's 10 and 11) have large dormers covering the majority of the rear roof. I understand from the Council that there is no planning history for these dormers, however this does not mean that they are not lawful.
10. The adjacent dormers do not appear to be new development and the Council have not confirmed that they are unlawful or under investigation in terms of a potential breach in planning. Large dormers of similar form are also visible on other properties in the immediate area. The neighbouring dormers are material considerations and give them significant weight.
11. The dormer is noticeable in the streetscene when entering Haddon Close, visible to surrounding properties and the trainline close to the site also offers views of the dormer. Whilst the dormer is large it is comparable to others on neighbouring properties and would not diminish the built form of the property, nor be overbearing or dominant in the streetscene.
12. Roof ridge heights in general in the terrace are regular, notwithstanding this the increase in ridge height at the appeal site is not dissimilar to a nearby property within the same terrace. A chimney on the front roof plane positioned on the shared boundary between No 12. and No. 11 does screen to a degree the difference in ridge height when viewed from within Haddon Close. I find that the variation in ridge height does not look out of keeping with the overall terrace.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of area nor the property itself. There is no conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the DMD and Policy D3 within the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seeks to create a strong sense of place, achieve good design appropriate to the local context.
14. There is no conflict with the Framework which seeks to secure good design which adds to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

16. Conditions relating to standard time limit for commencement of development, plans to be adhered to and materials to be used are not relevant or necessary as the development is complete.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR