
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May, 2017

by G. Rollings, BA (Hons) MA (UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th June, 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3170515

First Floor Flat Lynton, Meadowcroft Road, Southgate, N13 4EA

- 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 Mr Abraham Georgiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref: 16/05156/FUL dated 10 November, 2016 was refused by notice dated 4 January, 2017.
 - The development proposed is a hip-to-gable and rear dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip-to-gable and rear dormer roof extension at First floor flat Lynton, Meadowcroft Road, Southgate, N13 4EA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/05156/FUL dated 4 January, 2017 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan; 01A; 02A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the building of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site accommodates an end-of-terrace, two-storey building housing two flats. This appeal involves the upper-floor flat, and proposes an extension into the loft to create a new floor of accommodation, along with rear dormer and side hip-to-gable roof extensions, to expand the internal loft area.
 4. The appeal site is on the northern side of Meadowcroft Road, which is lined with terrace houses similar to the appeal building. Although it is within a short terrace of three, the opposite end of the terrace is close to a longer terrace, and both of these have gable-end rooflines. The only other side roof hip visible in the view from Green Lanes is on the building adjacent to the appeal site, at 571 Green Lanes. However, there is a substantial gap between these two buildings along
-

with a change in ground level, and as such, there is minimal symmetry linking their rooflines.

5. The rear projection of the appeal dwelling is flush with the main part of the building, and the gable extension would result in a height extension to the common flank wall, to form the new gable end. The existing wall is already large and clearly visible from the westbound approach along Meadowcroft Road, and the new part of the wall formed by the gable extension would provide additional visual interest to this otherwise incongruous element in the street scene. There would be no significant additional visual harm.
6. The proposed dormer extension and window would be reasonably modest in size, due to its setbacks from the roof eaves, ridge and side. Its proposed asymmetrical position on the roof would allow for the rear projection, and also limit its visibility from the street. When viewed from the rear of the dwelling, including private views from surrounding properties, it would not appear obtrusive or overbearing. I noticed similar dormer extension examples on nearby buildings, from views to the rear of the appeal property, and as such, I do not consider that the proposed development would be out of character.
7. The Council's adopted *Development Management Document* (2014) (DMD) Policy DMD 13 provides prescriptive standards for roof extensions. The proposed extensions would be in keeping with the intention of the policy, which is for residential extensions to preserve the character and distinctiveness of the area. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, nor conflict with DMD Policy DMD 13, for the above reasons.

Other issues

8. A neighbour on the property adjoining the appeal site to the west has raised concerns that the extensions would restrict the sunlight currently reaching the garden and side aspect of that property. The existing features of the house, together with the northerly aspect of the gardens, would limit the impact of the extension on sunlight levels, and there would be a similarly minimal impact on daylight. These effects would not be of a sufficient degree to result in significant detrimental impacts on the living conditions of occupiers of the adjacent property.

Conditions

9. The appellant recommended conditions which I have considered in light of the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. They are necessary, reasonable and enforceable in the interests of securing an acceptable development. Condition 2 is necessary in the interests of proper planning and to ensure that the development is carried out as approved. I have taken into account the appellant's comments on the necessity of a condition requiring the specification of materials, but given that the proposed building materials are not shown on the plans, I have imposed condition 3 to preserve the appearance of the building area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Rollings INSPECTOR