



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2023

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3309411

66A The Mall, Southgate, Enfield, London N14 6LN

- 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 Attila Erkal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/02091/FUL, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "loft conversion with rear dormer and front skylights, addition of floor on rear out-rigger."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It has been brought to my attention that third party representations had not been made available to the appellant at the application stage, nor were they included with the appeal. I requested copies of these representations, and the appellant was invited to comment. No comments have been received. I am satisfied that no parties have been prejudiced by this and I have had regard to the third-party representations in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site, 66a The Mall, relates to a first floor flat within a substantial, two-storey semi-detached property. The dwellings along this side of The Mall are attractively designed with a strong sense of architectural rhythm to their front elevations. There is a greater degree of architectural variety to their rear elevations.
5. The proposed development involves the erection of a rear dormer with a projecting gable extension and rooflights to the front elevation. The rear dormer would take the form of an L-shaped extension, which includes a flat roofed dormer to the main roof slope, together with an upwards extension of the rear gabled projection. I note that the proposed dormer would be set in from the boundary with the attached neighbour and be located above eaves level and below the ridge level of the main roof, which would meet or exceed some of the minimum requirements specified by Policy DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (DMD). I also note that the external materials would be in keeping with the host property.

6. However, the proposal would involve unsympathetic alterations to the rear gable projection, an architectural feature of the property, which I observed as being replicated on the rear elevations of the majority of the neighbouring dwellings. Although some of the characteristics of the gabled feature would be incorporated into the proposal, the alterations required to facilitate the development, would result in a scale and design of development that would, given its height and depth, dominate the host roof to the detriment of the architectural form of the building.
7. Overall, the proposal would create an overly large, bulky addition to the roofline, which would result in a dominant form of development that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property. As such, the design and scale of the extension proposed would not be an appropriate form of development that is of a high-quality design. Consequently, the proposal fails to compliment or enhance the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. Whilst I accept that the proposal would not be visible from The Mall, it would be clearly visible from neighbouring properties and gardens. In these views, the proposed development would be a conspicuous and unsympathetic feature that would detract from the character and the appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
9. My attention has been drawn to the existence of rear dormers on some nearby properties, including the attached neighbouring property which I noted had a large dormer extension. However, I observed these are mostly of a different design to the proposal before me, and most do not adjoin or extend the gabled projection of the host dwelling in a similar manner. I also observed the gabled extension to the roof line of 37 Selbourne Avenue which is of a more similar scale and design to the proposal. However, this is an incongruous feature of this property that does not contribute positively to the surrounding area.
10. I have also had regard to the Appellant's case which makes reference to development undertaken in the locality, including at No 70 which has been granted planning permission for a dormer extension by virtue of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. I also acknowledge that the dormer extension proposed, would in some respects, be of a smaller scale to others within the local area. However, the appeal property is a flat so does not benefit from any permitted development rights for extensions. As such, it is a matter of limited weight.
11. The Council has not raised any objection to the rooflights within the front elevation. I am satisfied given their position and modest size that they would be a discreet addition which would not detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
12. I have had regard to the desire of the appellant to achieve sustainable development and to make an efficient use of the site without extending the footprint of the building. The proposed development would meet the needs of the present occupants by allowing them to expand their home and create additional living accommodation, improving its suitability for family use. However, this would be a private benefit which would not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.

13. I have found no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment in relation to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring properties and highway safety. However, the absence of harm on these matters these respects are neutral factors which weigh neither for nor against the development.
14. On balance, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This would conflict with Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 (CS) and Policies DMD6, DMD13 and DMD37 of the DMD. These policies, amongst other things require, roof extensions to be of an appropriate size and location, to be in keeping with the character of the property, and not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having regard to all the policies brought to my attention, the conflict with Policy CP30 of the CS and Policies DMD6, DMD13 and DMD37 of the DMD leads me to conclude that there is conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR