



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3365025

15A Brimsdown Avenue, Enfield, EN3 5EN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Edmir Sternaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/04264/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of increased width to first floor extension, loft conversion, front porch, and outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to a two-storey, end of terraced dwelling constructed after planning permission was granted for development described as '*Sub-division of site and erection of an end-of-terraced 2 storey dwelling house involving cycle and bin store together with extension to roof and alterations to fenestration at rear to existing property*' (Ref 21/02834/FUL). In August 2022, planning permission was refused for development described as '*Proposed first floor extension, loft conversion, outbuilding and front porch*' (Ref 22/02750/FUL). A subsequent appeal was dismissed in October 2023 (Ref APP/Q5300/W/23/3318119). At that time, the Inspector noted that the building work had taken place and that the appeal had been considered as an amended version of the previously approved scheme.
3. At the time of my visit the dwelling displayed the gabled roof, rear dormer, and balcony as was considered by the previous Inspector. The current appeal proposal seeks to alter the existing design. Part of the proposal includes the addition of a roof extension to the hipped roof form of the originally approved dwelling and expanding the width of its first-floor rear projection.
4. The Council has raised no concerns with regard to the front porch, outbuilding and first-floor extension. I have no reasons to disagree. The porch is a modest and subservient addition to the front elevation. The outbuilding is modest in size and reflective of other similar nearby structures. The proposed changes at first-floor would see an originally approved first-floor rear addition adjacent to a similar projection at No 15 expanded to the full width of the dwelling. It would have a shallow depth and a tiled hipped roof that would reasonably harmonise with the roof form of the originally approved scheme. I do not need to address these elements of the proposal further.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed loft conversion upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property fronts Brimsdown Avenue and occupies a corner plot with a side elevation tight to the back edge of the pavement along the return to Osborne Road. It sits to one end of a terrace of three within a predominantly residential neighbourhood comprising mostly two-storey terraced and semi-detached homes, the majority of which having retained their original hipped roof form. The appeal property was originally designed with a hipped roof. Plans provided to me of the approved scheme show a balanced and symmetrical roofscape to the short terrace. The dwelling as built was judged by the previous Inspector to unbalance the terrace. The combined form of the rear dormer, hip-to-gable roof extension and first-floor rear extension with balcony over was considered to be top-heavy and overly bulky in a prominent corner position and harmful to the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area. The current proposal would revert back to a hipped roof with a side, partially gabled dormer which would wrap around the rear elevation and link with a flat roof rear facing dormer.
7. Section 4.5 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD), adopted in 2014, addresses residential extensions. DMD Policy DMD13 deals specifically with roof extensions. Amongst other things it states that roof extensions will only be permitted if they are of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane and are in-keeping with the property and not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area. Dormer windows are required to be inset from the eaves, ridge, and edges of the roof. The policy further states that side roof extensions must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or pair or group of which it forms part.
8. Although the proposal would reintroduce a partially hipped roof form, the front facing pitch to the roof of the side facing dormer would be flush with the front main roof slope. Similarly, the side dormer's ridge would run contiguous with the ridge to the main roof, which would extend across almost the full width of the dwelling. The symmetry of the terrace would remain conspicuously unbalanced, contrary to Policy DMD13 part 2.
9. Despite the use of matching materials, I cannot agree with the appellant's assertion that the proposed roof extensions would be seamless with the host dwelling and well-proportioned. On the contrary. The top rear corner of the side dormer would project beyond the plane of the rear roof slope with a flat roof and would wrap around to join with the rear dormer. The rear dormer would similarly project beyond the plane of the side roof slope and on the opposite side would reach up to the boundary with the attached property at No 15. Neither the side dormer nor the rear dormer would be fully set in from the edges of the roof. Their combined form would be awkward, large, and bulky, with little respect shown for the intended hipped roof form of the dwelling, which would be barely perceived. When seen from the rear in particular, where the rear elevation is exposed to full view along Osborne Road, the roof extensions would be dominant with the dwelling remaining top-heavy. In these regards there would be further and significant conflict with Policy DMD13.

10. Overall, I find the proposed loft conversion comprising a linked side and rear dormer would appear unsympathetic and incongruous, with little consideration shown for the context of its surroundings or the architectural composition of the dwelling. In addition to the conflict with Policy DMD13, by appearing inappropriate within its context with insufficient regard to its surroundings there would also be conflict with DMD Policies DMD8 (which the appellant drew to my attention), DMD37 and Core Policy 30 of the Council's Core Strategy, adopted in 2010, as far as between them they require a high quality standard of design for new development. For the same reasons there would be conflict with The London Plan (LP) Policy D4 as far as it requires the delivery of good design, and the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

11. The Council has referenced DMD Policy DMD6 and LP Policy D5 within their reason for refusal. Policy DMD6 deals with the density of residential development and cross references the LP's density matrix. LP Policy D5 deals with accessible and inclusive design. Neither are directly relevant to the appeal proposal. Notwithstanding, I have found clear conflict with other relevant policies of the development plan.
12. My attention has been drawn to examples in the locality along Brimsdown Avenue, Osborne Road, and Goldsdown Road where properties have been extended in a variety of ways at roof level. I do not know the planning history to all of these, but based upon the information before me, none appear to relate to a prominent corner plot. I have been provided with the details relating to a grant of planning permission at 43 Goldsdown Road (Ref 23/02937/HOU) for development described as '*Extension of roof to side to form gable end, rear dormer with Juliette balcony with balustrade and front roof lights*'. I note the officer's report identified some conflict with Policy DMD13 but that on balance, given the wider context with other large rear dormers in the vicinity, it was considered that there would be no significant harm to the character or appearance of the area. However, those findings do not reflect mine as they relate to the proposal at 15A Brimsdown Avenue. I am not aware of any directly comparable development in terms of form, siting, or prominence. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
13. Any improvement to the existing development at No 15A carries little weight in support of the current appeal proposal given the past planning history of the property and the unsuccessful attempt to secure planning permission for the works that have been carried out.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR