



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 October 2020 by S Witherley

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3251700

27 Old Park Road, LONDON, N13 4RG

- 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 A O'Rourke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00094/HOU, dated 10 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of rear dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. No. 27 is a semi-detached property located in a predominantly residential area on the eastern edge of the CA. The Lakes Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015) (the CACA) identifies that the CA is largely made up of late 19th and early 20th century semi-detached properties, with occasional terraced blocks. The CACA identifies that the significance of the CA is substantially derived from the special architectural and historic character and collective value of its high-quality housing.
5. The host property is part of a run of matching semi-detached houses which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area on account of their symmetry and architectural detailing. To the front are attractive bay windows, gable roofs and entrance porches. At the rear is an original two storey outrigger with a two-storey bay which is mirrored on the attached dwelling. Whilst there is some evidence that development to the rear elevations of properties in this part of the street has taken place, it appears in the main to have survived without major infill, replacement or structural

alterations¹. As a result, I consider that the attractive and symmetrical rear elevations and roof slopes contribute positively to the value of the street and its importance to the character and appearance of the area. Notwithstanding that the principal elevations face the street, the relatively unaltered rear aspects depict the original design of the buildings and form part and parcel of the character and appearance of the CA as an area of high-quality housing.

6. The proposal would see a boxed dormer sited on the main rear roof slope which would cover part of the outrigger.
7. The resulting scale of the proposal, despite it being set down from the ridge of the main roof slope and set in from the chimney located on the flank wall, would appear as a dominant addition that would significantly alter the existing roofscape of this building. The square, box-like, proportions would contrast unsympathetically against the varied ridgeline of the original dwelling and would result in an awkward visual arrangement where the dormer intersected with the valley gutter of the lower outrigger. In addition, the dormer would be directly adjacent to the shared boundary of the adjoining neighbour its scale and prominent position would disrupt the pleasing symmetry that currently exists in the rear façade of both properties.
8. Moreover, as the proposal would be in close proximity to the chimneys on both the main roof slope and outrigger, its bulky design and scale would detract from these attractive and decorative original features. As such, the proposal as a result of its design, scale and form would detract from the overall character and appearance of both the appeal building and the surrounding CA.
9. Despite the close spacing of the neighbouring dwelling, which would partially screen views of the roof extension from further away, the site would still be sufficiently visible from surrounding rear views within the block and the unsympathetic scale and design of the roof alteration would dilute and disrupt the existing visual symmetry along the rear of the street which presently adds to the character of the area. Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, taking account of local character. That applies to all development, irrespective of its prominence in the public realm.
10. Notwithstanding that the development would be located to the rear of the property and the level of harm caused is considered less than substantial, it is, nevertheless, to be given considerable importance and weight, having regard to the statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. No evidence has been submitted to show any public benefits. The proposal, therefore, causes harm that is not justified or outweighed, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
11. Reference has been made to other dormers in the area, however, I am not familiar with the history of these nor have I been provided with any details as to when or if planning permission was granted for them. Nevertheless, from what I saw of other roof extensions in the street they highlight the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits to ensure that no further harm to

¹ As witnessed on my site visit and evidenced in Figure 28 of the CACA

the character or appearance of the CA arises. As noted, the immediate context remains largely unaltered and free of unsympathetic additions and the presence of dormer windows elsewhere does not set a precedent for further harm in that context.

12. The appellant asserts that the proposal would have fallen within the permitted development criteria prior to the changes to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO). Be that as it may, permitted development rights have been removed and there is no legitimate fallback position in terms of any consent granted through the GPDO. In such circumstances, I must consider the planning merits of the proposal and reference to what may be erected under a hypothetical scenario has not altered my recommendation in relation to the main issue above.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, it would conflict with Policies 30 and 31 of the Council's Core Strategy 2010 - 2025 (2010), Policies DMD 13, DMD 37 and DMD 44 of the Council's Development Management Document (2014) and Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan which seek to enhance local distinctiveness and improve the character of the area through high quality design appropriate to its setting and having regard to the special character of heritage assets.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR