



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3301642

12 Chiltern Dene, Enfield, EN2 7HH

- 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 Eugenia Kyprianou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/01693/HOU, dated 30 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'Side roof dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies D3 and D4 in the London Plan (2021), policy CP30 in the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) and policies DMD13 and DMD37 in the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) which together, seek to encourage and deliver high quality design. In particular, policy DMD13 seeks to ensure that roof extensions are not visually dominant or intrusive.
3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house which is located at the top end of a sloping road within a residential area. The pair were designed with an attractive asymmetrical appearance with the appeal dwelling having a prominent, projecting gable fronted design and its neighbour having a recessed pitched roof with a side gable end. The projecting gable would have been the main feature of the pair. This pair of semis are one of two similar pairs in the road and there are many other pairs and terraces of dwellings built to a similar design in the surrounding area.
4. The proposal, which has already been built, seeks permission for a side dormer on the right-hand side of the roof, adjoining its neighbour, when viewed from the street. It matches the existing dormer on the left-hand side of the roof which was deemed lawful under a Certificate of Lawful Development in 2021. Although the proposed dormer has restored the symmetry of the gabled roof which has been visually unbalanced by the left-hand side dormer, this is outweighed by the introduction of a further amount of significant bulk at roof level which is clearly seen from the road. By reason of its size, scale and siting, it is overly dominant, undermining the principal gable and detracting

from the original design of the dwelling and the pair. Its bulk is emphasised by the prominent, deep white fascia board.

5. The appellant has referred to other examples of similar dormers in the surrounding area. I have no information regarding the planning status of the two dormers at no 10 Chiltern Dene, next door but one to the appeal site. However, whilst those dormers have a significant bulk, the dark cladding materials and dark coloured windows help them to recede into the background and allow the existing gable to remain the dominant feature when viewed from the road. I have no information regarding the planning status of the examples referred to at Roundhill Drive and Lonsdale Drive either but in each of those examples the main part of the dwelling has been rendered and the darker coloured materials of the dormers reduce the impact of their significant bulk to some degree. That is not the case in this appeal and many of the other examples of large dormers that I saw in the surrounding area, even if lawful as permitted development, are visually intrusive and are not a positive addition to the dwellings or the area. Therefore, those examples do not set a precedent for the development proposed here which, in addition to the harm caused to the dwelling and the pair, also causes, therefore, significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it does not amount to the high quality design sought by the development plan policies referred to earlier.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector