



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2023

by P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3305355

291 Green Lanes, Enfield, Southgate N13 4XS

- 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 E Huner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/00983/FUL, dated 18 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer with two no roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached building currently in office use. It lies in a predominantly commercial area, with some neighbouring elements of residential use. The rear elevation, to which the proposed development relates, is prominently visible from the adjacent public car parks and the entrance area to the neighbouring Morrisons supermarket.
4. The building features an existing 2-storey rear projection with a mono-pitched roof, the ridge of which sits on the boundary with the adjoining building. The adjoining building has a rear projection of matching depth and ridge height. The roofs of the rear projections on both buildings slope upwards to meet on the boundary, with a boundary parapet extending above the plane of both corresponding roof slopes. Though the strict dimensions and elevational features differ between the rear projections on the two buildings, the general roof shapes and massing are similar, with the result being a roofscape that largely mirrors its adjoining pair.
5. This theme spreads along the street, with the neighbouring buildings to the south all being similar semi-detached pairs. Though design elements differ, the roofscape remains largely uniform and uninterrupted, save for the discrete inclusion of features such as skylights, flues and chimneys.
6. The proposed development would introduce a dormer window to the mono-pitched side-facing roof slope of the rear projection. It would feature a flat roof, which would extend above the current ridge line and sit slightly below the

boundary parapet. Owing to its design, scale, siting and massing, the proposed development would appear as an uncharacteristic and dominant addition that would disrupt the harmony between the pair of semi-detached buildings. Due to the orientation of the building, the proposed development would be prominently visible from many surrounding public vantage points including the adjacent car parks and the approach to the supermarket, where it would appear as an incongruous addition that would fail to reflect the roofscape of the street and the surrounding built environment as a whole.

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area, which would conflict with Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (Adopted November 2010), Policies DMD6, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (DMD) (Adopted November 2014), and Policies D4 and D8 of The London Plan (March 2021). Together these policies seek, among other objectives, to promote good design and for development to be appropriate to its context and in keeping with the character of the property and surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. I note the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and the support to be given to proposals that promote town centre vitality and viability, and economic growth and productivity.
9. The proposed development would provide additional accommodation to support a business, which would support these objectives. However, paragraph 12 of the Framework also states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted. Decisions may be taken that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed. This also reflects Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
10. The proposal would provide a small increase in floorspace for storage use. Accordingly, this would provide only limited economic benefits and would not outweigh the harm previously identified. I therefore find no reason to determine the appeal other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

11. Taking all above matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR