

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3253911

14 Colne Road, London N21 2JD

- 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 Tanimul, Goldeneye Estates against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00246/HOU, dated 22 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, Section E of the appeal form indicates that a revised description was agreed with the Council, and states 'hip to gable roof extension to side with side window and 2nd floor rear extension incorporating rear facing gable'. This reflects the description given on the Council's decision notice, and I consider it a more accurate description of the proposal. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis.
3. A different name was stated on the appeal form (Mr Kypros Kyprianou), but it has subsequently been confirmed that the appeal should proceed in the name of Mr Tanimul, Goldeneye Estates in whose name the original application was made.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

5. Colne Road is predominantly characterised by semi-detached and terraced dwellings which are of similar general appearances, despite a mix of roof forms. The buildings are arranged on strong building lines fronting the street, and while varied dormer alterations are apparent, other extensions are mostly at single-storey level so that the rear building line and overall scale of the dwellings are for the most part broadly comparable. This results in a fairly regular street scene, and an attractive sense of coherence which is appreciable from Colne Road as well as the surrounding streets which connect to it.
6. The appeal site includes a detached dwelling at the junction of Solna Road with Colne Road. The dwelling has a gable to the side of the roof facing 16 Colne

- Road and a dormer and two-storey projection to the rear, but the set-down of the rear projection and hipped roof form closer to the junction lessen the building's total bulk.
7. The appeal proposes alterations to the roof to create a gable end to the side closest to Solna Road. In itself, the gable would not be out of keeping with the mix of roof forms on Colne Road. However, the height of the rear projection would also be increased to be level with the newly formed section of the main roof ridge. The rear projection is relatively deep, and in combination, these alterations would add substantial bulk and mass to the roof. This would be in addition to the existing fairly large dormer, and I find that the resulting scale of the roof would be disproportionate to the host dwelling, dominating its original form to the detriment of its character and appearance. The top-heavy appearance of the dwelling and its visual impact would be further exacerbated by the significant vertical emphasis which would result from the narrow gable design of the rear projection aligning with the main ridge, drawing attention to the upper part of the building.
 8. I acknowledge that there are varied alterations to the roofs of many of the buildings in the vicinity of the site. Nevertheless, I saw that these do not generally extend beyond the original footprints of the host dwellings, and those two-storey projections that are present to buildings are commonly set down from their roofs. This moderates the resulting scale of the topmost sections of the buildings. In contrast, the proposal would extend the highest part of the ridge over the fairly deep rear projection, resulting in a much larger roof to the building than is typical in the surrounding area and a far greater visual impact. This disparity would further underline the disproportionate nature of the appeal building, and notwithstanding some screening by street trees, it would be visible from both Solna Road and Colne Road where it would appear incongruous and jarring against nearby buildings.
 9. I accept that as a detached property, the appeal dwelling is already somewhat unusual in the street scene. Nevertheless, it sits reasonably comfortably alongside the characteristic terraced and semi-detached buildings nearby. The appellant contends that the proposal would serve as a landmark feature or punctuation to the adjacent row of dwellings. However, in my view, the excessive scale of the roof form would be an unsympathetic and dominant feature which would be conspicuously at odds with its surroundings.
 10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would accordingly conflict with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010, Policies DMD 11, DMD 13 and DMD 37 of the Development Management Document 2014, and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. Amongst other things, these policies require development which is appropriate to its context and the host building and which reinforces local character and distinctiveness. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which identifies achieving well-designed places as a key aspect of sustainable development.

Other Matters

11. Whether a proposal attracts comments in support or opposition is not in itself a ground for refusing or granting planning permission, and while I acknowledge comments submitted in support of the appeal proposal, this does not outweigh

the harm that I have found. That no harm has been identified in relation to living conditions for neighbouring occupiers is a neutral factor which weighs neither for nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR