



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2022

by P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3299032

263 Fore Street, Edmonton N18 2TY

- 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 Rubakanthan Thananayagam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/04685/FUL, dated 15 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice refers to the site's location within the Fore Street Edmonton Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals documents refer interchangeably to several titles for the Conservation Area, including reference to 'Church Street, Edmonton' in the title. For the purposes of consistency, I have used the title referenced in the decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including the significance of the Fore Street Edmonton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a first floor flat above a ground floor commercial unit in a terraced shopping parade. The site sits in a mid-terrace location and has a 2-storey outrigger to the rear. Though not shown on the existing plans, there is a small flat-roofed dormer window to the rear roof slope. There are some limited examples of rear dormer windows elsewhere in the terrace. However, its roofscape is generally uniform, and is characterised by the outriggers and rear roof slopes being free of structures.
5. The site lies within the Fore Street Edmonton Conservation Area. This part of the Conservation Area is characterised by ribbon development fronting Fore Street, and the Townscape Analysis forming part of the Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies the terrace within which the site lies as being 'neutral' buildings.

6. The new dormer window incorporates a dual pitched roof with a rear-facing gable and would sit on the eaves of the existing roof slope. The top of its pitched roof would adjoin the main ridge of the building. It would be larger than the one it replaces and would occupy a more central position on the roof slope.
7. The design and size of the proposed development would result in a top-heavy addition to the host property with its window design failing to reflect the proportion of windows below. Moreover, it would introduce a bulky addition into the roofscape of the terrace of which it forms part, which would be harmful to the appearance of the terrace as a whole. As such, the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Fore Street Edmonton Conservation Area and would result in less than substantial harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset. I have identified no public benefits arising through the proposed development that would outweigh this harm.
8. I note the appellant engaged with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) pre-application process prior to submission of the planning application and I have been provided a copy of the LPA's response, dated 26.05.2021. This makes clear that the response should not be interpreted as formal confirmation that a future planning application will be acceptable, nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of any future planning application. Paragraph 4.9 of the response also included specific reference to Policy DMD13 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document in respect of roof extensions, which requires roof extensions to *"be of an appropriate size and location within the roof plane and, in the case of roof dormers, inset from the eaves, ridge and edges of the roof (insets should normally be between 500-750mm)"*. As such, I cannot agree with the appellant's statement that the proposed design reflects the advice given by the officer in the pre-application response.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposals would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and less than substantial harm to the significance of the Fore Street Edmonton Conservation Area that would not be outweighed by public benefits. The development would therefore be in conflict with the aims of Policies CP30 and CP31 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (Adopted November 2010), Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD13, DMD37 and DMD44 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (DMD) (Adopted November 2014), and Policies D4 and HC1 of The London Plan (March 2021) which seek, among other objectives, to ensure developments maintain and improve the quality of the built environment, are of an appropriate bulk, scale and massing, are appropriate to their surroundings, and conserve and enhance heritage assets. The proposals would also conflict with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, which has similar design and character objectives. There would also be conflict with the statutory test set out in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I note reference to Policy D8 of the London Plan (March 2021) in the LPA's decision notice. However, this is concerned with development of the public realm and I do not find it to be relevant to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development would fail to accord with the policies of the Development Plan as a whole and there are no other considerations that

outweigh this conflict. For the above reasons, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR