



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2019

by K Stephens BSc (Hons), MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3225806
384 & 386 Green Lanes, Southgate N13 5PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Halim against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application, Ref 19/00073, is dated 12 April 2018.
 - The development proposed is three storey extension at rear of 384 for use by 386 only and relocation of existing external staircase for upper floor residential.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused for a three storey extension at the rear of 384 for use by 386 only and relocation of existing external staircase for upper floor residential.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal results from the Council's failure to reach a decision on the application submitted by the appellant within the prescribed period. However, within its appeal statement, the Council has set out its principal concerns with the size, bulk, scale and massing of the building and that there would be a detrimental impact on the occupiers of the existing flats. To this effect, the Council has set out two reasons for refusal had it been able to make a formal decision.

Main Issues

3. Accordingly, on the basis of the evidence before me, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the area, and
 - The living conditions of occupiers of the upper floor flats at No.386 with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises two traditional period three-storey mixed-use properties that form part of a terrace of similarly characterised properties, with commercial and retail uses on the ground floor and residential above. The row forms part of Palmers Green District Centre, but the area is also predominantly residential.

5. No.384 is a beauty salon at ground floor which extends the entire depth of the property and opens onto a vehicular width alleyway at the rear. It already has a two storey flat roof rear extension that is accessed by a rear external staircase. The adjacent three storey property (No.386) is a laundrette on the ground floor. The upper floors flats are accessed via a metal external staircase from the rear yard. The property has a single storey metal clad extension that forms part of the laundrette that projects into the rear yard, the end of which is bounded by palisade fencing. The appeal site sits between properties to the north that have a mixture of modern rear extensions, and properties to the south that are older small cottage-type mews buildings with pitched slate roofs.
6. The proposal is for the erection of a two storey extension with a mansard roof, at the rear of No.386, effectively resulting in a three-storey extension. The extension would provide additional commercial floorspace over three floors for the beauty salon at No.384 and would be accessed internally from the beauty salon. There would be two windows in the roof slope facing towards the alleyway. The single storey rear extension to the laundrette and palisade fencing would need to be removed to facilitate the proposed extension. The existing external metal staircase leading to the upper floor flats at No.386 would be relocated to the south side of the property between the side of the proposed extension and the adjacent mews property.
7. The top of the first floor of the extension would be approximately level with the ridge of the adjacent mews buildings, and the mansard roof would project up beyond that. The shape of the mansard roof and the height of the building would introduce a bulk, scale, mass and design of building at odds with extensions north of the appeal property, and also with the prevailing adjacent small cottage-type mews accommodation. As such it would not successfully bridge or blend with the different buildings either side, even with the use of matching materials. Instead, it would appear as an obtrusive and incoherent form of development. Whilst the extension would be at the rear of the property, the proposal would be seen as part of the alleyway and the mews-style buildings.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be in keeping with adjacent buildings and as such would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to London Plan 2016 (LP) Policies 3.5, 7.1, and 7.4 and Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) Policies 6 and 8. These collectively seek to encourage high quality design that positively contributes to the character of local places taking into account physical context and local character. These accord with guidance in chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') on striving for good design.

Living conditions

9. There are habitable rooms and a front door that serve the upper floors flats of No.386 that would look towards the proposed extension and its roof. The proximity of the extension to the rear of the building, coupled with its height, bulk, scale and massing would appear significantly overbearing and have an unneighbourly effect that would create an unsatisfactory outlook for the occupiers of the existing upper floor flats. Furthermore, the proposal would reduce daylight to these rooms due to its height and close proximity. Whilst the extension would be sited at the far end of the plot, it would be unacceptably

close to the rear of the building and the upper floor flats so as to cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers.

10. Due to the orientation of the building there would not be any significant overshadowing and there would be no privacy issues, as there would be no windows facing the flats.
11. I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of existing occupiers of the upper floor flats of No.386. The proposal would be contrary to LP Policies 3.5, 7.1, and 7.4 and Development Management Document 2014 (DMD) Policies 6 and 8, which seek to encourage high quality design and standards of accommodation and to preserve amenity in terms of light and outlook. This is in line with design guidance in the Framework.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that the extension would allow an existing business to expand, helping boost the local economy and potentially creating more jobs. However, these benefits are not of a scale that would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

K Stephens
INSPECTOR