



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2023

by J Wellstead BA(Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3302842

29A Eaton Park Road, Enfield, Southgate N13 4ED

- 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 Daniel Shaw against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/01504/FUL, dated 29 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer with roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace house which has been converted into two flats, one on the ground floor and another on the first floor. The property is set within an urban residential area on a long row of terraced houses and has a two-storey rear extension projecting into the rear garden, which is similar in size and shape to several others on the street.
4. The proposed development would include rooflights to the front of the property and a substantial rear dormer. The dormer would extend across the majority of the width of the host property with small insets below the ridge line and to each of the side boundaries.
5. Policy DM13 of the Development Management Document (DMD), Adopted 2014 requires that roof dormers should normally be inset between 500-750mm from the eaves, ridges and edges of the roof. The appellant argues that the shortfall of the inset to the rear dormer is insignificant and would be largely hidden from sight by the existing two-storey extension. Nonetheless, the dormer would not meet the required inset, as set out in this policy.
6. Furthermore, I consider that the limited inset to the roof and west elevation would result in a bulky and awkward addition to the roofscape which would be visible from the properties and rear gardens adjacent to the appeal site and the wider street scene. It would therefore appear as a dominant, incongruous addition and would not be appropriate to its context, given its scale, siting and inadequate inset. This would be inconsistent with the established roof lines of

the surrounding properties in the area. Thus, causing harm to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

7. My attention has been drawn to the rear dormers which have been added to No.27A as well as other properties along Eaton Road. During my site visit, I saw that the neighbouring rear dormer at No.27A was more inset than the appeal scheme, and centrally positioned on the roof, both of which combined to reduce the visual bulk and dominance of that development. However, I do not have the full details of those other schemes, so I cannot be certain that they are directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any event, I have dealt with the proposal on the basis of the evidence, and my site observations.
8. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed dormer would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. This would conflict with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025, Adopted 2010 and Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the DMD. These policies seek to maintain and improve the quality of the built environment by setting standards for new residential development. It would also be at odds with the Framework which seeks the creation of well-designed places which reinforce local distinctiveness, which this proposal does not achieve.

Other matters

9. I acknowledge that the Council has no concerns in regard to the proposed rooflights on the front of the host property. I have no reason to disagree with this assessment, however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above regarding the rear dormer element of the proposal.
10. There is extant planning permission¹ at the appeal property, for a smaller rear dormer 'fallback'. I consider that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that the previously approved development could take place, if I were to dismiss the appeal. Therefore, I have taken this 'fallback' position into consideration when reaching my decision and have afforded this substantial weight. However, from the evidence before me, I consider that the 'fallback scheme' would have a lesser impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area than this appeal scheme. Consequently, the fallback position advanced does not outweigh my findings.
11. The appellant asserts that the proposed dormer width is required to provide headroom for a new, conventional staircase, positioned directly above the existing staircase and leading up to the loft bedroom. However, it appears from the evidence, that the neighbouring scheme at no.27A² features a similar internal staircase but still maintains a suitable inset to the sides. Therefore, this consideration does not outweigh the harm I have already identified, or justify the proposal before me.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the development conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to carry sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

¹ 21/04190/FUL

² 18/01193/FUL

J Wellstead

INSPECTOR