



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019

by J Alderman BA(Hons) MA MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3229743

18 Church Hill, Southgate, London N21 1JA

- 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 Rotherham against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref:19/00649/HOU, dated 18 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. The Council in their Decision Notice have used a different explanation. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. In the vicinity of the appeal site Church Hill is characterised by semi-detached properties, there are also some detached properties and an apartment block across the road. A number of properties in the surrounding area have had alterations made, including extensions to their roofs.
5. The appeal property is semi-detached and situated on the corner of Church Hill and Park View. Church Hill has a moderate gradient and properties rise up the hill with roof levels reflecting this change in topography. The appeal property has a two storey side extension, which runs close to its side boundary, it has retained its hip style roof and there is also a rear extension.
6. The proposed development would comprise the construction of a gable end and pitched roof replacing the existing hip roof, along with front rooflights and a Juliette balcony at the rear. The ground and first floor would remain broadly

similar to their existing layout. A replacement garage is also proposed, which the Council confirm they have no objection to.

7. The appellant has referred to the mixture of property styles within the area, however, I have concentrated on properties within the vicinity of the proposed development as being most relevant.
8. The surrounding semi-detached properties in this part of Church Hill have mainly retained their hip style roofs, therefore the gable end would be out of character with the immediate surroundings.
9. In support of the appeal the appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties with gable ends in the locality that appear to have originally had hip roofs. I do not know the full circumstances of these cases, or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration, or indeed if any of them were as a result of permitted development. However, in any event the circumstances in each proposal are likely to be different, and the fact that apparently similar development has been granted permission is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. Consequently I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
10. Being situated on a corner plot the appeal property is particularly visible when descending Church Hill, the entire side and roofline of the property can be clearly observed. Similarly it is prominent when approached from Park View.
11. The appeal property is set down at a lower level than the pavement, although this is not to such a significant degree as to reduce the visual impact of the proposed development. The lower height of the appeal property in comparison to the neighbouring property on the opposite corner does assist to some degree, in that the proposed roofline would be at a lower level. However, due to the openness as a result of the corner location this fails to sufficiently reduce the intrusiveness and negative effect of the proposed development. As a result, it would appear overly prominent and out of place as a feature in the street scene failing to blend in sufficiently with neighbouring properties.
12. The dormer across the rear of the property would be substantial and would be visible from Park View and Church Hill and combined with the proposed roof extension would add an overly dominant feature in this location.
13. The adjoining semi-detached property retains its hip style roof. It is acknowledged that the extension to the appeal property means that the symmetry of the pair has been somewhat lost. However, the roofs remain consistent in style and the introduction of the gable end and different style roof would unbalance this and create an awkward aspect which would adversely impact the upon their appearance.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be detrimental to the balance and conformity of the semi-detached properties.
15. The proposed development would therefore fail to comply with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025, which addresses the quality of the built environment. It would also fail to comply with Policies DMD8 and DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014). Point 2 of the latter specifically deals with roof extensions and requires that such extensions do not disrupt the character or balance of a pair of properties. It would also fail to

accord with DMD37 which seeks to ensure that developments have appropriate regard to their surroundings. Finally it would not meet the requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), the former of which emphasises that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area. Policy DMD14, deals mainly with new side extensions and as the appeal property has already been extended to the side this policy is not directly relevant.

Other Matters

16. It is noted that the appellant has referenced potential permitted development rights but concluded that the appeal should be considered as a whole. This is the approach I have taken in coming to my decision.
17. I also note the appellant's concerns regarding the way the planning application was handled by the Council. However, this is not a matter for this appeal, which I have determined afresh and on its planning merits.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and so the appeal should be dismissed.

J Alderman

INSPECTOR