
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3233504
26 Harlech Road, Southgate N14 7BX

- 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 J A Scarou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/01182/HOU, dated 27 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the extension of existing basement level and lightwell at front to create a treatment room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of existing basement level and lightwell at front to create a treatment room at 26 Harlech Road, Southgate N14 7BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref, 19/01182/HOU dated 27 March 2019, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: The location plan - 26Harlch-D 100; Proposed ground and basement floor plan - 26Harlch-D 005; Proposed front and rear elevations - 26Harlch-D 006; Proposed section - 26Harlch-D 007; Proposed south elevation 26Harlch-D 008.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr J A Scarou against London Borough of Enfield. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural matter

3. The Council has raised as a reason for refusal the absence of a heritage statement. I consider that this is a procedural matter and I have determined this appeal in accordance with the plans that were considered by the Council at application stage.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of The Lakes Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The site lies within the Lakes Estate CA, a designated heritage asset which has an accompanying Management Plan. The dwellings within the CA display exceptional decorative qualities, most notably their porches and the window joinery, doors and stained glass, as well as decorative plasterwork, tile hanging and fine brickwork. The appeal dwelling displays these qualities and makes a positive contribution to the CA.
6. The appeal site is in a terrace of two-storey dwellings which rises gently along its length and the dwellings are stepped accordingly. The dwelling is a ground floor flat with a first floor flat above. The adjoining residential properties are similar in design and the majority have retained the attractive joinery to the frontage, which have large bay windows. The properties along the terrace have basements with staircases leading to doors. The appeal dwelling and its neighbours have hardstanding areas allowing vehicles to park. There is a low brick wall with a hedgerow on the boundary with No 28.
7. The appeal proposal is for the extension of the existing basement to form additional residential accommodation. The proposal would create a lightwell and the staircase would have three additional steps with a handrail leading down to the existing doorway. There would also be three new sash windows to the front elevation at basement level.
8. The new lightwell, new handrail and the additional steps are relatively small in scale in the context of the host dwelling and would not significantly extend into the hardstanding area. They would not be a prominent feature viewable from the street scene and would not dominate the host building or neighbouring properties. Whilst the Council argue that railings or grilles would likely be required for the development, these details do not form part of the appeal before me and I note that a discrete handrail forms part of the proposals. The design of the three proposed sash windows to the front would be consistent with those in the host dwelling and would not be visually prominent when viewed from the street.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a planning permission¹ granted in October 2016 for a basement extension, with lightwell and retaining wall and railing to the adjoining property, No 24. I note that there are some slight differences in that a small wall and grille formed part of the proposals. However, the proposals similarly introduce a lightwell, new steps to the existing staircase and new windows to the front elevation at basement level and the scale and nature of these proposals would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Given there have been no change in circumstances this permission is a material consideration which weighs in favour of the appeal proposal.
10. I conclude the appeal proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal complies with Policies 7.4, 7.5, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), Policies CP30 and

¹ 16/03741/HOU

CP31 of the Enfield Core Strategy, Policies DMD37 and DMD44 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014), the Lakes Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and the Lakes Estate Conservation Area Management Plan (2016) which require, amongst other things, that built development that impacts on heritage assets has regard to their special character and are based on an understanding of their context.

Other matters

11. I have had due regard to the contents of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal. I am also mindful of the Article 4 direction which applies to the CA.
12. I am aware that the Lakes Estate Conservation Study Group made references to the absence of a detailed window specification and the lack of detail to the lightwell and hardstanding. However, the imposition of a suitably worded condition would be appropriate to secure consistency of materials used in the host dwelling.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interest of certainty and it is not necessary to list the existing plans. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR