The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2020

**by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 03/11/2020**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3250745**
**85 Derwent Road Southgate London N13 4QA**

- 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 Mark Hoey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application Ref 19/03470/HOU, dated 8 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2020.
- The development proposed is extension to roof to part form gable end, rear dormer and rooflights to front.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Issue

2. Whilst described as part of the proposed development, the element relating to rooflights at the front was removed from the proposal. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area with particular reference to its Conservation Area status.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi detached property situated within the Lakes Estate Conservation Area where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that great weight should be attached to the conservation of designated heritage assets, in this case the Conservation Area (CA).

5. The Character Appraisal describes the CA as being characterised by closely spaced, mainly semi-detached housing with an overall impression of continuous lines of building. In addition, it notes that relatively few houses have undergone structural alterations visible from the street, and that the vast majority of the houses retain most, if not all, of their original features.

6. There is a strong sense of rhythm and continuity along this part of Derwent Road with the front gables of the properties forming a prominent feature within the street scene. Whilst there is some variation in design they form an architecturally cohesive group and the houses are generally well preserved examples of their time. The appeal property is one which retains much of its original character. The raising of the roof slope to form a gable would disrupt the roof slope and be an incongruous alteration to the form and design of the dwelling, detracting significantly from the original qualities of the property. It would lead to a significant change in the character and appearance of the appeal property to the detriment of the character of the CA.

7. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal by changing the form of roof from a hip to a gable would help to restore some symmetry between it's front/side and the neighbouring adjoining property, No 87 Derwent Road (No 87) which has a part gable side roof extension. It would not therefore be in conflict with criteria 2 within Policy DMD13 of the Enfield Development Management Document which requires development to not disrupt the character and balance of a pair of properties of which the dwelling forms a part . However, whilst there would be some benefit in ensuring some symmetry between two adjoining dwellings to the front, in this instance I do not consider the gable side roof extension at No 87 to be particularly sympathetic to the design and appearance of the original dwelling nor to the character and appearance of the CA. Nor do I have details of the circumstances in which the extension at No 87 was approved. As such, it does not provide sufficient justification to allow the proposed scheme which would be harmful to the original architectural quality of the appeal property. Moreover, Policy DMD 13 also requires roof extensions to be in keeping with the character of the property and not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area. This would not be the case in this instance for the reasons set out above.

8. The inclusion of rear dormer windows within the appeal scheme would not respect the fenestration pattern in the existing building as they would be out of character. The combination of the dormers with the conversion of the roof to a gable end would give a top heavy effect leading to a roof dominated at the rear by the bulk and projection of the conversion. Whilst the roofscape cannot be seen from the public vantage point it can nonetheless been seen from private views from the rear of properties on Derwent Road. Whilst these may not be public views they nonetheless form part of the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced.

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme would neither preserve or enhance the CA. Given the size and scale of the proposal within the CA as a whole, the harm that would arise would be localised and the impact on the CA would be less than substantial within the meaning of Paragraph 193 of the Framework. The proposal would have private benefits in the form of enlarged living accommodation for the occupiers of the property. However these are not public benefits which would outweigh the totality of the harm to the CA. Accordingly the appeal proposal would fail to comply with national policy.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed scheme would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Of the policies quoted by the Council it seems to me the most relevant are Policies DMD6 DMD13, and DMD37 in Enfield's Development Management Document and Core

Policy 30 which require development to be appropriate and in keeping with the property, and the design not to be inappropriate in its context. The proposed scheme would conflict with these policies. Local context and architectural quality would not be duly respected as set out in Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Local Plan (2016). The proposed scheme would also fail to preserve or enhance the qualities of the conservation area that contribute its heritage significance, and as such would be contrary to Policy DMD 44, to Core Policy CP31 and to London Plan Policy 7.6, as well as failing to satisfy the statutory duty in this respect.

**Conclusion**

11. Having regard to the above findings the appeal is dismissed.

*K Winnard*

INSPECTOR