
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2017

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3168579

1 to 12 St Onge Parade, Genotin Road, Middlesex, Enfield, EN1 1YU

- 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 Stanley Laufer Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/04259/FUL, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of 2 no. new rooftop flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Enfield Town Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the CA on its eastern edge. The Parade is located on the junction of Southbury Road and Genotin Road. The existing building is three storeys in height and addresses the corner of the junction. At ground floor there is a parade of shops. Above shop level the building is detailed with brick material and stone around the pairs of windows with curved detail evident on the parapet. The site is one of several parades of shops present in the wider town centre area of the CA. Being located on a significant road junction, opposite the station and at a point where the CA is entered the building is visible and makes a positive contribution. Accordingly, in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the designated heritage asset concerned is the CA and the appeal building is part of that designated heritage asset.
 4. The appeal scheme would contain three flats. To form the flats an additional floor would be added to the existing flat roof of the building behind the parapet. It would be set in from the front and sides of the existing structure and itself have a flat roof. The footprint shows that parts would project out and two new balconies would be formed. The materials shown on the plans are uPVC doors and windows and 'eternit slate' tile hanging.
 5. The building is on a prominent corner site and can be seen from some distance along both Southbury Road and Genotin Road. The extension would be an addition in height above the existing roof. I understand the building
-

benefits from additions previously allowed at appeal¹. However these did not include a rooftop addition. This scheme would form a fourth storey and project significantly above what should be the topmost element of the building. Further, being designed with a flat roof finish it would clash awkwardly with the strong curved detail to the existing parapet. In addition, in spite of the setback it would be prominent and would appear as an intrusive feature. This would be compounded by the material finish and window detail which would include groups of long windows and bi fold doors. As a result the overall composition of the front of the addition would appear at odds with the rest of the building.

6. The appellants have provided perspective studies of the roof from a variety of distances. Further I appreciate that there are some mansard additions in the wider area, that the scheme has been amended since a previous appeal² was dismissed and that there are some larger buildings now present along Southbury Road. Nevertheless, the long range views of the parade do not contain a large number of fourth storey roof additions. Due to its size and prominence, the large flat roof addition would be visible from wider views in the street scene. I cannot agree that it would be obscured by the larger buildings Pinnacle House and Bovril House. Indeed the appellants' perspectives demonstrate that this would not be the case. Therefore, overall, it would be a dominant addition to the roof of the existing building and the group of buildings within which the appeal property is located. As a result the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
7. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the CA. It has been put to me that the proposal would maximise development on the site and contribute to the stock of housing in the borough in an urban location with a PTAL rating of 6a; the homes would be energy efficient; there would be some limited economic benefits and income generation. Furthermore there would be no adverse impacts to neighbouring properties and the flats would be designed to meet the appropriate space standards. However, none of these matters is a public benefit that would outweigh the harm caused to the CA.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would therefore conflict with policies 30 and 31 of the Core Strategy, Development Management Document Policies 6, 8, 13, 37 and 44 and policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan which amongst other things, seek to conserve and enhance the Borough's heritage assets and encourage development that makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and require new development to be designed to the highest standard. The proposal would also be in conflict with the guidance in paragraph 132 of the Framework that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.
9. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Q5300/W/15/3132576

² APP/Q5300/A/13/2205051