
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by R Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3363997

17 Hardy Way, Enfield, EN2 8NN

- 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 Citygate Construction Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application ref is 24/03973/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and conversion of garage to habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer with front rooflights and conversion of garage into habitable room involving alterations to front elevation at 17 Hardy Way, Enfield, EN2 8NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03973/HOU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan, OCT24_17HW_02, OCT24_17HW_04.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description in the banner heading above has been taken from the application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered to that on the application form. I have used the description given on the appeal form and decision notice in my decision above because this more accurately describes the development applied for, which also includes alterations to the roof form to accommodate the proposed dormer. The Council determined the proposal on that basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal dwelling is a single storey detached property located in a suburban residential area. It is situated in a discreet set back position at the end of the cul de sac. The surrounding area is characterised by clusters of different dwelling types and styles. There are two storey dwellings on one side of Hardy Way, including the neighbouring property at no.18 Hardy Way and single storey dwellings on the opposite side of the road including the neighbouring properties at no.16 and no.24. There are rear dormers evident on surrounding dwellings within the vicinity of the site.
6. The hipped roof style of the existing dwelling is not critical to the prevailing character of the area. I noted during my site visit that there are gabled roof forms in the vicinity with two of the neighbouring dwellings and a cluster of single storey dwellings to the rear of the site having a gabled roof form. The proposed hip to gable alterations in the roof form would create visual bulk at roof level, however, there would only be a modest 0.3m increase in the ridge height. It would retain a low-profile roof aesthetic and would not appear discordant in the street scene given the existing variation in the ridge lines in the surrounding area. As the neighbouring property at no.18 is a two storey dwelling the impact of the increased roof height would not stand out in the street scene.
7. The proposed flat roof box dormer would be visible from within the street scene of Hardy Way to the rear of the site. However, I noted there are rear box dormers visible on surrounding two storey dwellings in the vicinity of the site and therefore it would not appear as an incongruous feature given the wider context. This element would also be set down from the ridge of the roof, once the existing roof had been increased in height, and would be set back from the eaves and set in from the sides. It would be proportionate to the roof of the dwelling and would assimilate with its overall form and design.
8. From my site inspection, I observed that rooflights on the front roof slopes are not unfamiliar features in Hardy Way or the surrounding streets. I note that the Council's decision notice refers specifically to 'two rooflights on the front roof', although on the submitted proposed elevation plan 5 rooflights are shown on the front roof slope. Given the setback position of the dwelling and its siting within a discreet position within the street scene, the proposal for rooflights on the front elevation would not result in an unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.
9. The Council appears to raise no objection to the proposed garage conversion. From the submitted evidence, I too find this element of the proposal acceptable as the proposed increase in depth of the garage would not be visible from within the street scene and would be subordinate to the host dwelling in scale, size, bulk and mass. It would be appropriate in design and general appearance and would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
10. For the reasons given above, I find that the appeal scheme would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the host

dwelling. Consequently, it would not conflict with Policy DMD 13 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) which permits roof extensions of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane and in keeping with the character of the property and Policies CP30 Enfield Core Strategy 2010 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) which seek to achieve high quality design.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides clarity.
12. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing building/dwelling is imposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

R Aston

INSPECTOR