The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2017

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/16/3165937
1 Cannon Hill, Southgate N14 7DJ

- 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 Stavrinou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application Ref 16/04195/FUL, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2016.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing garage/annexe building and its replacement with a two storey dwelling providing accommodation within roofspace and basement.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage/annexe building and its replacement with a two storey dwelling providing accommodation within roofspace and basement, at 1 Cannon Hill, Southgate N14 7DJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/04195/FUL, dated 14 September 2016, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Southgate Green Conservation Area (SGCA) and the significance of non-designated heritage assets.

Reasons

3. No 1 Cannon Hill is located within the SGCA and comprises a detached dwelling sited in a large plot bounded by a brick wall and mature trees. The significance of the SGCA as a whole is centred on The Green and the three wide roads leading to it, one of which is Cannon Hill. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the wide highway, roadside trees, green verges and large symmetrical individually designed dwellings as significant features of Canon Hill. No 1 is included on the Council's Draft Enfield Local Heritage List with reference to its Arts and Crafts style, its large butterfly plan and association with the former Arnos Grove Estate. A wall runs along the boundary of Nos 1 and 3 and is locally listed owing to its historic association with the former mansion house.

4. Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that applications that affect non-designated heritage assets require a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the

significance of the heritage asset. In terms of its overall form and roof design I agree with the appellant that the existing garage/annexe is not a fully balanced and integrated addition to No 1. In this respect, its demolition would not be harmful to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset subject to it being replaced by a building that is complementary and high quality in design.

5. During my site visit, I saw that the properties at Nos 3 to 11 Cannon Hill occupy a large proportion of their respective plot width and thus leave small gaps between one another. Nonetheless, a pleasant spacious character prevails at this section of Cannon Hill owing to the depth of residential plots and the width of the adjoining highway with its green verges and trees.

6. The distance between the proposed dwelling and No 1 would be greater than is the case with the annexe/garage and comparable with those between nearby properties. The appellant's uncontested plot width measurements of the proposed dwelling and of surrounding residential plots are also similar. The site would also retain a depth comparable to surrounding plot depths. In this respect, the subdivision of the existing curtilage would be compliant with part d) of Development Management Document (DMD) Policy DMD 7 which requires individual plot sizes and layouts created by garden development to not adversely affect the existing local pattern of development.

7. Owing to the boundary brick wall, the extent of tree coverage at the site, and in the context of the existing garage/annexe, the proposal would not be a particularly noticeable feature when viewed from the surrounding area. From the adjoining street, the proposed roof design would take the appearance of a hipped roof form. Moreover, the crown roof design would be in keeping with roof forms in the surrounding area, which includes Southgate Beaumont and No 11 Cannon Hill. Taking the above into account, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the SGCA as a whole.

8. Although not subordinate in scale, the scale of the dwelling would be similar to No 1 and with properties in the wider area. The principal elevation would be symmetrical and formal in appearance with materials used, including window details, matching those in surrounding properties. In addition, the appellant also intends to reuse the stained glass window in the reconstructed side elevation of no 1. A suitably worded condition would ensure reinstatement of this window as anticipated by the appellant.

9. Views of the locally listed wall from the garden of no 1 will be partly obscured by the proposal. However, this effect would be negligible on the significance of the listed wall and outweighed by the repair works proposed to it. Taking the above into account, the proposal would be a high quality design and would not have a harmful effect and thus preserve the significance of the non-designated heritage assets.

10. In reaching this view, I have considered the setting of grade II listed buildings at The Hermitage, The Coach House and Cannon Hall, and on Broomfield House: a grade II registered park and garden. However, taking into account the boundary screening at the appeal site, the proposed design and the separation distances involved, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on these noted heritage assets.

11. Concern has been raised regarding precedent. However, the combined circumstances of the case, which include the large size of the site, the annexe/garage, the levels of screening and the design proposed, would not be easily replicable in the surrounding area. Moreover, each application and appeal must be determined on its own individual merits.

12. Therefore the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the SGCA as a whole or on the significance of the non-designated heritage assets. Consequently, the proposal would meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CP31, DMD Policies DMD6, DMD7, DMD37 and DMD44, London Plan Policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.6, and 7.8, and Paragraphs 131-135 of the Framework. Combined, these policies require development to preserve the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets and be a high quality design in relation to local character, scale, form and pattern of development.

Conditions

13. Despite requests, suggested conditions have not been forthcoming from the Council. Consequently, the conditions in the attached schedule are based on suggestions made by consultees, the appellant, and those typical to the development proposed.

14. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring samples of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the adjoining building and the SGCA. A condition requiring reinstatement of the stained glass window is necessary based on my reasoning above.

15. Taking into account the residential character of the area and the demolition and construction involved, the conditions regarding demolition and construction are necessary in the interests of neighbouring living conditions. Based on comments made by the Council's Tree Officer, a condition requiring compliance with the recommendations in the appellant's arboriculture report is necessary.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1497.P1.01, 1497.P1.02, 1497.P1.03, 1497.P1.04, 1497.P1.05, 1497.P1.06, 1497.P1.07, 1497.P1.08, 1497.P1.09, 1497.P1.10, TPP/1CHSL/010A.

3) No development shall take place until samples of all external facing materials to be used for the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details and retained as such thereafter.

4) No development shall take place until details of the stained glass window annotated on the plan no 1497.P1.04 to be reinstated to the north/side elevation of 1 Cannon Hill have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

5) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 08.00 – 18.00 hours on Mondays to Fridays and 08.00 – 13.00 hours Saturdays, and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.

6) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the recommendations contained with the Arboriculture Report undertaken by David Clarke Chartered Landscape Architect and Consultant Arboriculturist Ltd, dated July 2016.

7) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction and Demolition Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:

   i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;

   ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;

   iii) storage of plant and materials used in demolition and constructing the development;

   iv) wheel washing facilities;

   v) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;

   vi) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;

   The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.