



---

## 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/D/23/3314706**

**72A Kingsfield Drive, Enfield, London, EN3 6UB**

- 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 Zeki Karakurt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref: 22/02174/HOU, dated 17 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2022.
  - The development is described as 'Extension to roof to form gable end, rear dormer and rooflights to front.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. Policy DMD13 of Enfield's Development Management Document (DMD) sets out various criteria for roof extensions. The most relevant criteria for the appeal proposal being that dormer windows need to be inset from the eaves, ridge and edges of the roof, and side roof extensions must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or group of properties of which the dwelling forms a part.
4. The appeal site forms the end property of a terrace of five. 72 Kingsfield Drive was originally at the end of the terrace until planning permission was granted for a side extension and subdivision of the dwelling to create a new dwelling, number 72A. The extension to create the new dwelling was designed with a hipped roof, first floor bay window and arched doorway underneath a lean-to porch, which are design features that complement the character of the existing terrace.
5. However, the appeal proposal, which would involve a hip-to-gable extension and a rear dormer window, fails in this regard as it would unbalance the roof form of the terrace, and diminish its character in the process. The extension permitted to create 72A follows a logical hierarchy with its rear wing subservient to the main ridge line of the terrace.

6. Conversely, the proposed dormer window would only be marginally set down from the main ridge line and it would not be set in from the edge of the roof on the side elevation at all, which is contrary to part 1.a. of Policy DMD13. When this would be combined with a hip-to-gable extension, the overall result would be a bulky, top-heavy extension that is visually intrusive in the street scene. This would be compounded by the fact the property occupies a corner plot at the intersection between Kingsfield Drive and Broadoak Avenue, thereby maximising its negative visual impact when viewed from both streets.
7. The appellant has highlighted other roof extensions constructed nearby which they believe to be similar to the appeal proposal as a justification for the appeal to be allowed. However, having assessed the evidence provided to me, it is clear the other examples are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal both in terms of the size and design of the extension and the site context that I have described above. In any event, each case must be assessed on its own individual merits, which is what I have done in making this decision.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with DMD Policy DMD13, for the reasons set out above.

*Other Matters*

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

**Conclusion**

10. The proposal would conflict with the Development Plan as a whole and there are no material considerations which lead me to consider otherwise. For the reasons I have stated above, the appeal is dismissed.

*J N Seymour*

INSPECTOR