



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2023

**by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 21 February 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3312295**

**27 Brackendale, London N21 3DH**

- 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 and Mrs S & S Bull Richards against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref 22/02934/HOU, dated 27 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2022.
  - The proposed development is a loft extension, ground floor kitchen extension, extension to front porch and internal alterations.
- 

### Procedural Matter

1. The Council has described the development as "single storey rear extension and single storey front extension, extension of hipped roof at side and rear dormer with Juliet balcony and front rooflights (part retrospective). As this more accurately describes the development I shall use it below.

### Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension (part retrospective).
3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front extension, extension of hipped roof at side and rear dormer with Juliet balcony and front rooflights at 27 Brackendale, London N21 3DH, in accordance with the terms of application ref: 22/02934/HOU dated 27 August 2022 and subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted, which for the avoidance of doubt only relates to the single storey front extension, extension of hipped roof at side and rear dormer with Juliet balcony and front rooflights, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan (1:1250 scale), block plan (1:500 scale), 01 (existing ground floor and first floor plan), 02 (existing loft and roof plan), 03 (existing elevations and sections), 630 11PA (proposed ground and first floor plan), 630 12PA (proposed loft and roof plan), 630 13PA (proposed section) and 630 14PA (proposed elevations).
  - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

## Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect on (a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 29 Brackendale Road.

## Reasons

5. The dwelling on the appeal site is a substantial two storey semi-detached property of traditional appearance characterised by a hipped roof and bay windows. Brackendale consists of both detached and semi-detached properties of similar age, design and appearance, a number of which have been extended. Permission was granted for various extensions to the appeal property in 2019 (the 2019 permission).<sup>1</sup> It appears to be agreed by the parties that this permission has been implemented by virtue of the laying of foundations relating to the rear extension.

### *Character and appearance*

6. The Council's decision notice makes clear that the objection in respect of this issue only relates to the rear dormer and roof additions. Policy DMD13 of the Development Management Document (2014) (DMD) sets out some specific criteria in relation to roof extensions including that they should be of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane, in keeping with the character of the property and not be dominant when viewed in the surrounding area. Additionally, dormers should normally be inset from the eaves, ridge and edges of the roof by between 500 and 750mm.
7. The proposed rear dormer would be much larger than that approved under the 2019 permission but would be set down from the ridge and away from the party wall boundary towards the centre of the roof form of the semi-detached pair, but it would be set close to the edge of the newly created gable end of the roof. Whilst, it would be a large addition to the roof, it would not be significantly larger, in terms of width, to that which exists at No. 23 Brackendale, which I was able to view from the rear garden of the appeal site. In addition, it would be set noticeably below the ridge of the dwelling, unlike that at No. 23 which appeared to extend right up to the ridge. Whilst it would be close to the new roof edge, it would not be readily visible in the street scene. Overall, its size and location would be acceptable in these circumstances.
8. The proposed hipped roof extension, whilst introducing a gable end roof form, would also retain the lower hipped roof elements to the side of the dwelling. The additional bulk viewed in the street scene would be limited and I note that there are other nearby properties that have gable end roof shapes. The Council also suggest that the roof additions would create an 'awkward juxtaposition' between roof forms which would also be out of character and detract from the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. However, I see no reason why the two roof forms should appear 'awkward' with the small gable end simply extending above the ridge of the hipped roof.
9. I agree that the proposed extensions would introduce roof forms that are not present on the attached semi-detached dwelling, but this property has itself

---

<sup>1</sup> Council ref: 19/01301/HOU

been altered with a flat roofed two storey side addition which has already disrupted the symmetry of the pair somewhat.

10. Overall, I find that the proposed roof additions would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. It would thereby accord with Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) (CS) and DMD Policies DMD6, DMD13 and DMD37 which, in addition to the above, seek to ensure that the public realm is well-designed and that high quality, design-led development which has special regard to its context and surroundings is provided.
11. In respect of this issue I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks high quality development that is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

#### *Living conditions*

12. Policy DMD11 states that single storey rear extensions should not exceed 3 metres in depth beyond the original rear wall for semi-detached properties nor should they exceed a line taken at 45 degrees from the mid-point of the nearest original ground floor window of any adjacent properties.
13. The 2019 permission included a single storey rear element up to the boundary with the adjoining property at No. 29 but the current proposal is for a greater depth, in excess of that set out in Policy DMD11. No. 29 retains its original rear ground floor bay window which is the nearest to the boundary, with small side pane angled towards the appeal site. In addition, there is a difference in ground levels between the two properties such that No. 29 lies at a lower level. Having regard to these factors, I consider that the greater depth of extension now proposed would have a harmful impact in respect of outlook and natural light.
14. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I find that the single storey rear extension would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties. It would thereby conflict with CS Policy CP30 and DMD Policy DMD11 which seek high quality, design-led development which has special regard to its context and to prevent adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties.
15. With regard to the Framework, I find that this element of the proposal would fail to contribute to achieving well designed places and would not be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment nor provide for a high standard of amenity.

#### **Conclusions**

16. Overall, whilst the proposed roof alterations, including dormer, would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings, the proposed single storey rear extension would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring property, No. 29 Brackendale, by reason of loss of light and outlook. I note that the Council has not raised objections in respect of the single storey front extension and I agree that it would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the property and the amenity of neighbouring properties and thus complies with the relevant policies of the development plan.

17. Having regard to the submitted plan, it is clear that the proposed rear extension is physically separate and severable from the remainder of the proposed development, therefore I intend to issue a split decision, refusing permission for the rear extension but granting permission for the front extension, hipped roof extension and rear dormer with Juliet balcony and front rooflights.
18. As suggested by the Council conditions to ensure that the development so approved is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in matching materials are necessary in the interests of proper planning and the visual amenities of the area.
19. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed in part and allowed in part.

*P Jarvis*

INSPECTOR