The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2017

by Y Wright BSc (Hons) DipTP MSc DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3178605
24 Queen Anne's Gardens, Enfield, Middx EN1 2JW

- 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 M W Groom against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application Ref 17/01268/HOU, dated 18 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
- The development proposed is rear dormer loft conversion and two front rooflights.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I requested submission of the Bush Hill Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015) and The London Borough of Enfield Council (Enfield Borough Conservation Areas) Article 4(2) Direction 2006 (as confirmed) from the Council as they had not been submitted with the appeal evidence. I have taken account of these documents, along with all other evidence and representations submitted, within my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and the Bush Hill Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Much of the character of the Bush Hill Park Conservation Area is derived from its plan form and semi-formal layout of detached and semi-detached residential properties. Many of these dwellings were built during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, though more recent modern blocks of flats have replaced some of the larger properties. This pattern of development is clearly visible within the core area of the estate which includes Queen Anne's Gardens. The area also has a leafy and spacious character due in part to the extensive street trees and verge planting.

5. No 24 Queen Anne's Gardens is a semi-detached property set back from the highway. Within the Bush Hill Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2006) (CA) the property is defined as having been built between 1896- 1914. It still has some original features still intact.

6. The proposal would introduce a box-style dormer window into the rear roof slope of the dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge that it would be set in from the roof edges, set down below the main roof ridge and set back from the rear gutter, it would nevertheless still occupy a large proportion of the rear roof area. Consequently its overall size and box design would result in a bulky and dominant development on this elevation, which would be an uncharacteristic feature when compared to neighbouring properties. Whilst there would be limited views of it from within the street scene, it would be visibly prominent from some neighbouring properties and gardens. Whilst the proposed rooflights would be relatively modest in size, their introduction and siting within the front roof slope would result in them being an intrusive addition to the host property.

7. Whilst my attention has been drawn to other similar development within the locality, I saw on my site visit that these features are not unduly prevalent and therefore do not form prevailing characteristics within the area. Accordingly they do not set a precedent. Furthermore such development cannot in itself justify a proposal which would otherwise be unacceptable, especially where it is considered that national and local policy have changed. Moreover each proposal must be determined on its own planning merits.

8. I am mindful that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource that should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, including any harm or loss of significance through development within their setting. The Framework also places great importance on development being of good design and responding to local character to ensure the integration of new development into the existing environment.

9. Consequently, taking all the above factors into account, I consider that the proposal would introduce incongruous additions to the host dwelling which would appear out of keeping with it and would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore conclude that the development would not preserve the character or appearance of the Bush Hill Park Conservation Area. Accordingly the proposal would be contrary to the Enfield Council Core Strategy (2010) (CS) Core Policy 30 which seeks to maintain and improve the quality of the built and open environment and CS Core Policy 31 which includes seeking development that that has regard to the special character of heritage assets.

10. It would also conflict with Enfield's Development Management Document (2014) (DMD) Policy 13 which, amongst other things, seeks roof extensions that are in keeping with the character of the property and are not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area; DMD Policy 37 which seeks high quality design and DMD Policy 44 which includes seeking development that conserves heritage assets.

11. The development would also not be in accordance with the Framework and the London Plan (2016) (LP) Policies 7.4 and 7.6 which seek high quality design; LP Policy 7.8 which, amongst other things, states that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Y Wright

INSPECTOR