
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2021

by I A Dyer BSc (Eng) FCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3255149
19A Bourne Hill, Southgate N13 4LJ

- 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 & Mrs Martin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/01135/FUL, dated 5 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a rear and side dormer with Juliette balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit I was unable to access the garden to the rear of 19/19A Bourne Hill. I was, however, able to view the rear roof of the appeal site from Burford Gardens, a side road off Bourne Hill to the west, sufficient for me to make a full consideration of the effects of the proposal. I do not, therefore consider that any party will suffer injustice for me to determine the appeal upon the information before me and the restricted site visit.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. 19A Bourne Hill is a flat forming the upper floor of one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings facing onto Bourne Hill, a busy urban road. It lies in an area with occasional detached dwellings, but predominated by two-storey dwellings, either semi-detached or in short terraces.
5. The dwellings in the area have tiled roofs. Whilst those opposite area have extensions, including side dormers, and both hipped and gabled roofs, those on the same side of the road as No 19A retain predominantly hipped roofs. These appear on the ends of the detached and semi-detached dwellings, and the terraces, providing a sense of symmetry and balance to the building blocks. This balance and symmetry are positive characteristics of the area within which No 19A sits.
6. The site is not within a Conservation Area and the building has no specific protected status. No 19A has a hipped roof typical of its neighbours alongside.

This is matched in form by its conjoined partner and so, notwithstanding minor alterations to the properties, including the replacement of the roof tiles, the roof form of the pair makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area identified above.

7. The proposal would add a side and rear dormer to the existing roof. In doing so, the roof of the pair of semi-detached dwellings within which the proposal lies would become unbalanced and the sense of symmetry would be undermined. Further, the proposed roof form would be a complex, bulky addition to the simple roof form that currently exists. Whilst the proposed materials for the proposal would match those used, both currently and historically, in the surrounding area, the proposed roof form would, by virtue of its complexity and position, introduce a dominant, discordant feature, out-of-keeping with the other roof forms in the locality. This incongruity would be readily apparent to anyone passing the site on Bourne Hill and on Burford Gardens.
8. In view of the importance that I have placed on the balance and symmetry of the buildings in the area this incongruity, together with its visibility from the public realm, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the site and the immediate area.
9. At the time of my site visit I observed other roof forms that do not exhibit symmetry with their neighbour. However, I have limited information regarding the planning history of these. These properties are, however, on the opposite side of Bourne Hill from the appeal site and they do not undermine the character and appearance of those buildings alongside No 19A. Thus their presence does not, of itself, justify further harm to the character and appearance of the area and I have, in any case, determined this appeal on its own merits.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The proposal would thus be contrary to Policy 7.4 of The London Plan (2016), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Council Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), and DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (2014). This is because these policies seek to ensure that the design of development complements, reinforces or enhances the character and legibility of the neighbourhood, requiring, in particular, that roof extensions should be in keeping with the character of the property, and not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area, and must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or pair or group of properties of which the dwelling forms a part.

Other Matters

11. The appellants point to the benefits of the additional space and greater energy efficiency. However, the proposal would not provide any additional residential units and the benefit of a larger, more energy-efficient unit in this location is limited and would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area which I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

I Dyer

INSPECTOR