



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2023

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3309859

65 Shrubbery Road, Edmonton N9 0PA

- 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 Koxhaj against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02334/HOU, dated 30 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a proposed infill extension at loft dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed infill extension at loft dormer at 65 Shrubbery Road, Edmonton N9 0PA in accordance with the terms of application Ref 22/02334/HOU, dated 30 June 2022 subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. EX-L001 Existing OS Map Location dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-P001 Existing Ground Floor dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-P002 Existing First Floor dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-P003 Existing Loft dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-P004 Existing Roof Plan dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-E001 Existing Front/ Rear Elevations dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-E002 Existing Side Elevations dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-S001 Existing Section AA dated June 2022; Drawing No. EX-S002 Existing Section BB dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-L001 Proposed OS Map Location dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-P001 Proposed Ground Floor dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-P002 Proposed First Floor dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-P003 Proposed Loft dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-P004 Proposed Roof Plan dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-E001 Proposed Front/ Rear Elevations dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-E002 Proposed Side Elevations dated June 2022; Drawing No. PR-S001 Proposed Section AA dated June 2022; and Drawing No. PR-S002 Proposed Section BB dated June 2022
3. The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on: the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No. 64 Shrubbery Road with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a two storey end of terrace dwelling with rear outrigger in Shrubbery Road, adjacent to a public footpath linking to Fore Street and from which the rear elevation of the property is readily visible. The area is residential, primarily made up of terraced dwellings, and the Fore Street Edmonton Conservation Area (the CA) abuts the rear boundary of the site. This immediate part of the CA is defined by a range of building styles, including traditional buildings on the western side of Fore Street with a range of more modern shop front fascia at street level.
4. Various alterations have been made to the property. A flat roof dormer runs the full length and width of the rear outrigger, diagonally across from a second dormer on part of the rear roofscape of the main dwelling. These cannot be seen from the front elevation of the property, and wider views from Shrubbery Road are limited. However, they are clearly visible from the footpath to the south, where they are notable additions to the immediate area, while limited glimpses are also possible from Fore Street and the CA.
5. The proposal relates to an infill extension at roof level. It would adjoin the two dormers present, combining to create a singular feature on the roofscape of the property. From my observations on site, the current dormers are inset from the eaves, ridge and edges of the roof. The submitted plans show that the proposal would align with these features, such that this inset would be replicated and respected. While Policy DM13 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (the DMD) suggests that an inset should normally be between 500-750mm, this is not drafted as an absolute requirement. In any event, the limited inset of the proposal would be masked by the other dormers to which it would join.
6. I acknowledge that the combination of the proposal and the current dormers would create a sizeable feature at roof level. While similar additions of this scale are not prevalent in the immediate area, the current roofscape at the dwelling is already distinguished by its alterations such that the proposal would not appear out of place at the property. In addition, in combining with the two dormers to create a singular feature, it would address the somewhat disjointed nature of the current roofscape.
7. Due to its positioning, the proposal would have minimal visual impact on the surrounds. It would not be visible from the front elevation of the dwelling. From wider views on Shrubbery Road, the footpath to the south of the site, and Fore Street it would be largely screened by the dormer extensions already present at the property. In this context, the proposal would not adversely affect any significant views into, out of, or through the adjacent CA and as such would have no adverse effect on the character or appearance of the CA.
8. For the reasons given, the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In this regard, it would comply with

Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (the London Plan), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2012 – 2025 (2010) (the CS), Policies DMD6, DMD13 and DMD37 of the DMD and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as they seek to ensure good design that does not harm surrounding character and roof extensions that are of an appropriate size, location and inset, in keeping with the character of the property and not dominant in the area.

Living conditions

9. Although not listed in the reasons for refusal, the Officer's Report raises concerns that the proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of occupiers of No. 64 Shrubbery Lane with regard to outlook.
10. The additional built form of the proposal would be visible from the rear elevation of No. 64 when looking towards the site. However, views in this direction are already dominated by the existing outrigger dormer at the site, such that the addition of the proposal would not create a significant change in outlook from this location.
11. Located adjacent to, and largely masked by, the prominent outrigger dormer at the site, the proposal would not read as an overbearing addition or lead to an undue sense of enclosure for the residents of No. 64 either from the rear habitable room windows of the property or the back garden. As such, residents' enjoyment of these spaces would not be negatively impacted.
12. For the reasons given, the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of occupiers of No. 64 Shrubbery Road, with regard to outlook. As such, it would comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan and Policy DMD8 of the DMD and the provisions of the Framework insofar as they seek to ensure adequate living conditions and preserve amenity in terms of outlook.

Conditions

13. Building works were underway at the time of my visit. However, it was unclear whether the proposal has been constructed in its entirety. As such, the standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with approved plans are necessary for certainty and in the interests of proper planning. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the materials match those of the existing building in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, the proposal would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 1 of this decision.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR