



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3322432

7 Ulleswater Road, Southgate, Enfield N14 7BL

- 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 Richard Tennant against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00222/HOU, dated 24 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear and side dormer and Velux windows to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house with front and rear gardens, with an off street parking space in the front garden. It is in a street made up of similar Edwardian properties that forms part of the CA. This was designated for its significance as an area where Arts and crafts influenced design results in a cohesive and richly designed residential area.
4. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. The proposal is for a loft conversion involving a rear and side box dormer extension, with roof lights to the front roof slope. The proposed roof level extension involves the alteration of the hipped roof of the appeal dwelling to create a side gable end to the property. This would match the side gable end to the appeal dwelling's semi-detached pair at 9 Ulleswater Road (No.9), resulting from an earlier loft extension to this adjoining property.
6. The proposed box form of the dormer extension and hip to gable alteration would appear to mirror the box dormer extension and roof alterations at No.9, which seems from the material before me to have been undertaken prior to the

designation of the CA in 2010. From my site visit there appears to have been many other rear box dormer extensions in the local area, many of which appear to be of some age. These, along with the dormer extensions at No.9 do not reflect the Edwardian arts and crafts influenced design of their host properties and appear visually incongruous and dominating to the houses to which they have been carried out.

7. The proposed rear dormer extensions to the appeal dwelling would involve a gable end that would, when viewed from the front, rebalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair of which it forms part. However, the scale and box like massing of the proposed dormer extension would not reflect the existing roof forms or design of the appeal dwelling. The proposed size and concomitant lack of setting in from the edges, ridge and eaves of the existing roof and the loss of an existing chimney stack, would further result in the proposed extension appearing as a dominating and incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling.
8. Although the proposed extension would be ostensibly towards the rear of the property, there are extensive views of the rear of the appeal dwelling and other houses that front Ulleswater Road from the public realm in Conway Road. In these views the proposed roof extension would, due to its scale and box like massing, appear as unduly prominent. Therefore, similar to other existing rear box dormer extensions in the local area, the proposal would not reflect the original roofscape. As such, the proposed extension would be in stark contrast with the otherwise cohesive streetscape which forms a significant element of the significance of the CA.
9. The proposed roof lights in the front roof slope would be relatively small additions that reflect the approach taken to the insertion of roof lights in the front roof slope of many properties in the street and the CA. As such, I find that this aspect of the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the CA. Lack of harm in this instance is, however, a neutral factor in my considerations.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to front dormer window extensions in Ulleswater road, I find, however, that these do not reflect the design, scale or positioning of the proposed dormer extensions and do not form a direct or compelling exemplar. As such, I have afforded these only very limited weight in my considerations.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the reflect the character or appearance CA, thereby causing harm to its significance. This would be contrary to policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), policies DMD13, DMD37, DMD44 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014), policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework). Collectively these seek development that is high quality and design led, is in keeping with the character of the host property, reinforces locally distinctive or historic patterns of development, has no negative impact on streetscene and has regard to the special character of heritage assets.
12. Whilst the Council's decision notice sets out that the proposal would be contrary to policies H3 and H4 of the London Plan (2021), these policies relate

to meanwhile use and affordable housing and I find they are not relevant policies with regard to the Council's reason for refusal.

13. Although I find that on balance the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, in accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Whilst the proposal would result in a larger property with improved living conditions for its occupiers, these are substantially private benefits. I must give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA and substantial weight to the effects on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling that I have identified. I consider that the benefits do not outweigh this harm.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR