

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2017

by J Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3173764

Focus House, 497 Green Lanes, London N13 4BP

- 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 Tansmol Mohamed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/03460/FUL, dated 21 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is extensions to offices.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council raises no concerns regarding the proposed single-storey rear extension. Accordingly, while I will need to consider this issue, the main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor rear and roof extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached house which has been converted into offices. The appeal site and its pair, No 499, front Green Lanes, but can also be seen from residential development on Cromie Close to the rear of the appeal site. The building has an original two-storey outrigger and existing accommodation in the roof space with both front and rear dormers. The existing rear dormer is small in scale and lies close to the junction of the main and outrigger roofs.
 4. The proposed development consists of a single-storey rear extension, first floor rear extension and dormers on the main rear roof and the outrigger's roof.
 5. While the depth and design of the outriggers of the semi-detached properties on this part of Green Lanes vary, the pitch and ridge height of the roofs to the outriggers remain consistent. Although the overall height of the building at No 497 would remain unchanged, the ridge height of the two-storey outrigger would increase, creating an uncomfortable relationship with the neighbouring two-storey outrigger at No 499. Despite the proposed outrigger only increasing in depth to match the neighbouring outrigger at No 499, the proposed outrigger would also increase in width. This would alter the outrigger roof's pitch. Both the raising of the ridge height and the modification to the roof's pitch would change the overall profile of the rear of the building and the nature of the building's relationship with neighbouring buildings, particularly No 499.
-

6. The proposed development includes an almost full width dormer on the main rear roof and a further dormer on part of the two-storey outrigger's roof. The dormer to the main rear roof would only be set up from the building's eaves and down from the roof's ridge by a small margin, which would give it a bulky appearance. When viewed from the rear of the site and Cromie Close, the dormers would form an L shape with the boxy outrigger dormer lying at a very slightly lower position than the dormer to the main roof. These roof extensions would be unduly prominent and incongruous, particularly when taken together with the other proposed extensions.
7. The proposed first floor extension and dormers would introduce features which would significantly alter the building's proportions. Given the size of these proposed extensions and their lack of coherence with the original form of the building and its neighbouring properties along Green Lanes, I consider that they would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposed single-storey rear extension is of an appropriate design, size and scale relative to the original building. I agree with the Council's view that the proposed single-storey rear extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, neither this nor the unaltered important front elevation of the property would address the harm identified above.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As policies DMD11 and DMD13 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document 2014 (IEDMD) relate to extensions to residential properties, I cannot apply these policies in this instance. Even if I were to apply these policies, it would not change my overall conclusion. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 and policy DMD37 of the IEDMD. Policies CP30 and DMD37 both set out general design principles to improve the quality of Enfield's built and natural environment. The proposal would also be contrary to a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appeal proposal would enable the existing office accommodation to be extended and refurbished, which would benefit existing and potential future occupiers and potentially aid the local economy. However, this benefit would not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
11. Notwithstanding my findings above concerning the effect of the single-storey rear extension, I have not issued a split decision in this instance as this element of the scheme forms an integral part of the overall proposal and I have no information to suggest that the appellant would wish to proceed with the single-storey rear extension separately.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above and having taken account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

J Gilbert

INSPECTOR