
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3170875

15 Bourne Avenue, Southgate, London N14 6PB

- 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 Daniel Theobald against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/01359/HOU, dated 31 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and side extension, first floor side extension and loft conversion with front roof lights and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear and side extension, first floor side extension and loft conversion with rear dormer at 15 Bourne Avenue, Southgate, London N14 6PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01359/HOU, dated 31 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DAT/PL/01, DAT/PL/02, DAT/PL/03, DAT/PL/04, DAT/PL/05, DAT/PL/06 (Northern side elevation), DAT/PL/06 (Rear elevation), DAT/PL/07, DAT/PL/08 Rev A, DAT/PL/09 Rev B, DAT/PL/10 Rev A, DAT/PL/11 Rev D, DAT/PL/12, DAT/PL/13 Rev A and DAT/PL/14.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description in the heading above has been taken from the application form. However, it is clear from the evidence before me that the proposal was amended by the appellant to remove the front roof lights, prior to the Council making their decision. The Council determined the application on that basis and so shall I. I have amended the decision accordingly.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Meadway Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Council do not object to the proposed ground floor extensions or the dormer window within the rear roof slope. Having visited the site, I have no reason to disagree with this assessment and therefore my consideration of this appeal focuses on the first floor side extension.
5. The site lies within the Meadway Conservation Area ('MCA'), the significance of which mainly derives from its peaceful, interwar residential streets of substantial 2 to two and a half storey detached and semi-detached houses. Properties are of a cottage style with varied roof configurations, detailing and architectural features and constructed from a traditional but limited palette of materials. The properties are clearly influenced by the Arts and Crafts and Garden Suburbs movements and are set in streets with planted verges with continuous front boundary walls or railings to the street and mature planting and street trees that emphasise the pleasant leafy and suburban character of the area.
6. It was evident from my site visit that although gaps existed at first floor level above single storey side garages and extensions, in this part of Bourne Avenue a number of properties and extensions were sited close to the side boundary. This included a similar extension which has recently been completed at No. 11¹.
7. Despite being a further addition to the side of the host property that would reduce the size of the gap, some space would still be retained at first floor level. This would allow views to the rear and I do not consider that on its own, or in combination with the extension at No. 11, that the proposal would create a terracing effect that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal has been designed to reflect the extension at No. 11 and it would be clearly subservient and sympathetic to the host property, sited in line with the height of the existing front gable projection, set back from it and well below the main roof. Appropriate materials could be secured by condition and in the context of this part of the MCA I see no reason why the repetition of this type of extension on the appeal property would be inappropriate or harmful to it.
9. Furthermore, the large Conifer tree within the front garden of the appeal property would be retained thereby preserving the landscaped setting of the MCA. Whilst the existing arrangement of chimneys on the side elevation would be altered, I do not consider this is sufficiently harmful to justify dismissing the appeal and I note that a chimney has been retained to the rear of the extension² which would reflect the one retained at No. 11.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the MCA. It would not therefore conflict with Policies DMD13, 37 and 34 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document 2014 or Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010 or Policies 7.4, 7.6 and

¹ P14-01884PLA.

² DAT/PL/13 Rev A.

7.8 of the London Plan 2016. Amongst other things and when read as a whole, these require a high quality and design led approach, that development affecting heritage assets is sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail and that the Borough's heritage assets are preserved and enhanced in accordance with national policy.

11. In the context of the Framework, the proposal would not cause harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset and therefore would not conflict with the heritage objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

12. I have been referred to a dismissed appeal in 2016 at No. 34 Greenway for what the Council contends is a similar proposal. However, I have not been provided with the full details and therefore cannot be certain that it is directly comparable to the proposal before me. In any event each case must be determined on its own merits and it therefore does not alter my view in relation to the main issue.
13. In reaching this view I have had regard to the representations made by an adjoining occupier which, whilst in support of the Council's position also refer to the effect on their living conditions. I note that the Council did not object on these grounds and in my view, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. A condition is required to ensure compliance with the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the materials to be used to match existing is also necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the MCA.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole and the Framework. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR