



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2023

by J N Seymour BA (hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3309455

100 Mandeville Road, Enfield, EN3 6SH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to determine the application within the prescribed period of a decision for a householder application.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Cedric Perrochaud-Lechertier against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 22/01223/HOU, is dated 7 April 2022.
 - The development is described as 'Rear dormer loft conversion including raising of the roof ridge'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. In its Statement of Case the Council maintain there are inaccuracies with the drawings, specifically regarding the height differential between the appeal property and the neighbouring property at 102 Mandeville Road. However, I observed on my site visit that the appeal property is indeed set down lower than number 102. This point has also been clarified by the appellant in their final comments. I am content that the drawings are an accurate representation of the appeal site and its context, thus I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The appeal results from the failure of the Council to determine the planning application. However, it has supplied a statement outlining the decision it would have made had it been in a position to do so, which I have taken into account in my determination of the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Policy DMD13 of Enfield's Development Management Document (DMD) sets out criteria for roof extensions. The policy does not offer any specific guidance for proposals involving an increase in the ridge of a roof, but for dormer windows part 1.a. of Policy DMD13 advocates they should be inset from the eaves by 500-750mm.

6. Although the precise distance of the inset of the dormers has not been provided, it is clear from the scale bars provided on the elevation drawings that both dormers would not be inset by 500-750mm. The lack of an inset for the dormers results in them both appearing flush with the rear wings of the dwelling upon which they would be constructed. This would give the dormers a bulky, top-heavy appearance, particularly for the one to be built closest to number 102 because the flat-roofed dormer would sit awkwardly on top of the pitched roof structure with its apex sitting uncomfortably below the window sill. With both pitched and flat roof forms visible and competing against each other, the result would be a poorly designed dormer that fails to complement the character and architectural style of the dwelling.
7. The second dormer, albeit smaller, cumulatively would also detract from the character of the property by ensuring almost the entire original rear roof slope would be obscured from view. Contrary to the points made by the appellant in their final comments, I observed on site that Mandeville Road is characterised by dwellings that are mostly free of dormers and other significant roof alterations. Consequently, the introduction of two dormer windows in the manner described above would not be in keeping with the character of the property or the surrounding area, contrary to 1.b. of Policy DMD13.
8. The proposed materials for the dormers are unclear. The drawings are not annotated with the proposed building materials and the application form states the external walls are "rendered gables", which the dormers would match. However, I observed on site that the walls of the dwelling are brick and have not been rendered. The dormers are depicted on the drawings with horizontal lines, which suggests cladding in a material that is neither brick nor render. In any event, regardless of the material in which they would be constructed, the dormers would appear incongruous for the reasons I have described above, conflicting with Policy DMD13.
9. The appellant states that the rear dormers are of a size and bulk normally acceptable under permitted development and are not visible from public areas. Firstly, I have no evidence before me to confirm the proposed dormers would normally be permitted development and in any event, I must determine all elements of the appeal proposal that is before me. Secondly, the visibility of the dormers from public areas, or lack thereof, would not absolve the fact they conflict with the requirements of Policy DMD13 for the reasons I have set out above.
10. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies DMD13 and DMD37 of the DMD. Together these give specific criteria for roof extensions and require that development has appropriate regard to its context.

Other Matters

11. The Council has cited other policies in its Statement of Case, however I have not found them to be determinative for this householder appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons I have stated above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J N Seymour

INSPECTOR