



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

**by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 05 September 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3366672**

**52 Bramley Road, Southgate, Enfield N14 4HS**

- 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 Fida Mohammed Imal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref is 25/00027/HOU.
  - The development proposed is for a rear dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. I have utilised part of the description of the development from the decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposed development. The development subject of this appeal was in place at the time of my visit. Although it was covered by scaffolding, it reflected the plans that are before me. For clarity, I have dealt with the appeal based on the submitted plans.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises of a detached property set amongst other closely positioned detached and semi-detached buildings. It is set back from the road which is lined by a row of street trees and hedges that provides a verdant feel to the area. There is variety in the design and appearance of properties along Bramley Road in the vicinity of the site, although the presence of regular features, such as bay windows and hipped roof forms, contribute to a relatively consistent appearance in the streetscene.
5. The roof of the appeal property features different ridge heights, but the overall height of the dormer subject of this appeal has exceeded the highest part of the appeal building. It is also only inset a limited distance from both sides and the rear roof edges. As such, it has resulted in a large box like form at the roof level of the host building. It does not sit comfortably in the roof plane, despite its appropriate material finish and its scale dominates the hipped roof form of the host building.
6. The dormer, although being sited to the rear, is clearly visible from the front along Bramley Road. Whilst there may be some similarity in the height of the dormer

subject of this appeal and the height of the neighbouring property at 50 Bramley Road, the bulky form of the dormer has significantly altered the roof's appearance and stands in stark contrast to the roof forms of neighbouring properties. Although some properties in the area have been altered, including from hipped roofs to gable ends, with others having rear dormer additions, I have not been made aware of any examples of rear dormers whose heights have been extended above the ridge of the host property. The development referenced at 36 Bramley Road relates to a semi-detached property, where based on my observations, the dormer has not resulted in any noticeable increase to the highest part of the roof.

7. I therefore conclude that the dormer has an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such, it conflicts with Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025, Policies DMD 6, DMD 13 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document and Policies D4 and D5 of the London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design and development whose scale and form is appropriate to the existing pattern of development or setting. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks, amongst other matters, development that is sympathetic to local character.

### **Other Matters**

8. The appellant has made reference to a lawful development certificate<sup>1</sup> for a rear dormer which was granted by the Council. The dormer subject of this appeal, whilst it would be compliant with the volume limit set out at Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, would not be permitted development due to its height having exceeded the height of the highest part of the existing roof.
9. I note the rationale for the increased height was to secure an adequate internal height to ensure the space is usable, but it is the increased height of the dormer which has resulted in it having a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The dormer subject of this appeal would therefore be more harmful than the fallback position. As such, although a rear dormer could be constructed using permitted development rights, it would not justify the harm that I have identified.
10. There would be no adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties, but this is a neutral consideration and not one which weighs in favour of the proposal.

### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*F Rafiq*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> LPA Ref: 24/00549/CEA