



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/C/24/3351250

4 Broomfield Avenue, London N13 4JN

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Mirza Aamir Hussain against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The notice was issued on 9 August 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a rear dormer window and the raising of the roof ridgeline.
- The requirements of the notice are: 1. Remove the rear dormer window; 2. Reduce the ridge line back to that of the original height and roof form; 3. Make good the roof form, plain and ridge height to that of the original roof; 4. Remove all resulting materials from the premises; Or 5. Reduce the volume of the rear dormer window so that it complies with planning approval reference 23/00321/FUL; 6. Make good the roof by reinstating the ridge height to that of original roof; 7. Remove all resulting materials from the premises.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: Three Months
- The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a) an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary Decision: The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

Appeal Procedure

1. 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 Matter

2. The appeal scheme affects a property situated in a Conservation Area. Therefore, I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwellinghouse located in an area which is characterised by pairs of similar properties set within uniform streets. The site is within the CA, the significance of which is partly derived from the architectural and historic interest of the large and cohesive group of high-quality Edwardian houses in the area. The Lakes Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015) (CACA) identifies that the appeal property makes a positive

contribution to the CA and that it has nearly all its original features intact. Overall, the high-quality and the consistency of the dwellings, which includes the appeal property, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. The roofs of the dwellings on Broomfield Avenue are unusual in that they are split into two sections. They have a main pitched section to the front and a separate pitched section to the rear. There are several dormer windows to the rear roof slopes of the main pitched roof sections of the dwellings in the vicinity of the site. This includes a dormer window at the adjoining semi-detached property. There are several other dormer windows in the same stretch of dwellings, including some which stand out for their varying colour and materials. These installations give the roofscape a varied appearance, particularly to the rear of the dwellings when viewed from Broomfield Park.
6. The roof ridge has been raised by a small amount and is barely perceptible when viewed from Broomfield Avenue. It appears no higher than the roof ridge at the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. It is also lower than the parapet which separates the roofs. Although one side of the dormer window is slightly visible through the gaps between the dwellings, this is in glimpsed views only and from a short section of the street. When combined with its overall size, scale and siting, it is not harmful to the appearance of the street scene. Therefore, the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the area when viewed from Broomfield Road.
7. The raising of the roof ridge is even less evident when viewed from Broomfield Park to the rear. Moreover, the bulk of the dormer window is hidden by the pitched roof section of the rear part of the dwelling. It also has a similar height and appearance to the dormer window at the adjoining property. Furthermore, it does not appear substantially different to the numerous other dormer windows in the locality. In the circumstances, the development does not appear incongruous when viewed from Broomfield Park to the rear of the dwellings.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision¹ for a previous development which was allowed at the site. Although I do not have the full details of that appeal including the formal decision itself, from the plans before me, it appears to be very similar to the development which I observed on my site visit. The appellant indicates that the difference between the appeals is that the dormer window subject of the current appeal is 10cm higher than was previously allowed. I have no substantive evidence to contradict this. This difference is of such a minimal scale that it does not result in harm. This further persuades me that the development as constructed at the site is acceptable.
9. In drawing these conclusions, I am conscious that the CACA identifies that inappropriate roof alterations to roofs, such as the addition of box-dormers, are one of the issues that the CA is facing. I am also aware that Policy DMD13 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (2014) (DMD) states that roof extensions should be in keeping with the character of the property. Even so, for the reasons I have explained, the raising of the roof ridge and the dormer window is not harmful in this particular context, bearing in mind the varied roofscape it is situated within.
10. For the above reasons, even considering the great weight I must give to the conservation of heritage assets in accordance with the National Planning Policy

¹ Appeal reference: APP/Q5300/W/23/3315926

Framework, the development preserves the character and appearance of the CA. Therefore, it is not harmful to the significance of the CA. As such, it satisfies the requirements of the Act.

11. I therefore conclude that the development complies with Policies D4, D8 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD13, DMD37 and DMD44 of the DMD and Policies CP30 and CP31 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010). Amongst other matters, these require that developments have regard to the character of the area and conserve the significance of heritage assets.

Conditions

12. The development has already taken place, and I have not found any harm caused by it. As such, no conditions are necessary in order to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the development complies with the development plan overall. Accordingly, the appeal on ground (a) succeeds and I recommend that the deemed planning application should be approved.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the development already carried out, namely the erection of a rear dormer window and the raising of the roof ridgeline at 4 Broomfield Avenue, London, N13 4JN as shown on the plan attached to the notice.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR