



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2023

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3309017

37B Crawley Road, Enfield EN1 2NG

- 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 Ms I Young against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/01784/FUL, dated 20 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "Hip to gable and rear dormer extension with three roof lights at 37B Crawley Road".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form as the main parties have not provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area and the host building.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a hipped roof semi-detached building which is subdivided into flats. It is located in a residential street comprising similar properties. Notwithstanding the presence of a few examples of gabled roofs, the majority of buildings and pairs of semi-detached dwellings retain their existing hipped roof. This roofscape, and the space afforded by them positively contributes to the character of the area.
5. The rear dormer window would span the full width of the host building. It would project across the original roof, and the proposed hip to gable extension. Although the overall height of the host building would be unaffected, the extensive large flat roofed rear dormer, with large windows would result in it eroding the form of the original rear roof, particularly as it is not set in from the eaves, side and ridge of the host building. This is a requirement of Policy DM13 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (the DMD). Therefore, due to its scale, bulk and design it would fail to respect the proportions and features of the original property.
6. As noted above the appeal proposal would also create a gable end. However, the traditional spacing and roofscape afforded by the hipped roofs are locally

distinctive and largely intact. The gable end examples and other dormers I saw, did not form the prevailing character of the area due to their limited number. This change in the roof form would remove a characteristic feature of the area and would diminish the contribution of the generally consistent roofscape. The additional bulk would also unbalance the appearance of the two sides of the semi-detached building. The proposed hip to gable roof would also erode the space between properties and affect the rhythm of development in the streetscene.

7. I acknowledge that the appeal site is not within a conservation area, nor would it affect any heritage assets. I also note the Council does not raise concerns regarding the rooflights or materials. The rear of the appeal building is also not overly publicly visible. However, the development would also be visible from neighbouring properties and gardens, and the Council's policies are not restricted to that which is within the public domain. Therefore, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the host building.
8. Consequently, the proposal would not accord with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010 – 2025) and Policies DMD6, DMD13 and DMD37 of the DMD. Combined and insofar as they are relevant to the appeal, these seek to achieve good design and maintain local distinctiveness and sets out the Council's requirements in relation to roof extensions. For similar reasons, the development would also conflict with the London Plan (2021) Policies D4 and D8 which also seek to deliver appropriate design. The proposal would also conflict with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) where it seeks to achieve well designed places.

Other Matters

9. The Council has advised in their officer report that the gable extensions on Crawley Road were erected under Permitted Development. I have no evidence to the contrary that this is not the case. This limits the weight which I can attach to these cases, as flats do not have such rights. In any event, I have found the area is not characterised by these examples.
10. It is understood that alternative design may not achieve the requisite amount of floor space required by the appellant. However, this is a largely private matter. That and the absence of harm in respect of neighbouring living conditions does not outweigh the harm I have found above.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, which outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR