



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3252899

Land rear of 1A Conway, Southgate, London N14 7BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Michael McGuinness against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/03062/FUL, is dated 29 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "Demolition of existing garage, workshop and street fronting wall. Construction of new build 4-bed single family dwelling house, with associated wall fronting unto Conway, hard surfacing and landscape. Provision of dropped kerb vehicle crossover along Conway".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Lakes Estate Conservation Area, the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an area of land described as being used currently as a builder's storage space. The appeal site is located within the Lakes Estate Conservation Area (LECA).
4. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Moreover, paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The LECA in the immediate area of the appeal site is characterised predominantly by residential properties of variant styles but with traditional architectural detailing, materials and roof forms. The Lakes Estate Conservation Area Appraisal states that the special architectural and historic character of the LECA derives primarily from the homogenous, collective value of its high-quality Edwardian housing, which I concur with.
6. The proposed development would have a contemporary appearance with shallow roof form and mixed fenestration, including a mix of small, large and

corner windows. The proposal would be an incongruous structure with design details that would be out of keeping with the traditional architectural styles of the properties in the area.

7. The proposal would be a large structure that would appear prominent and detract from the existing built form. The proposed materials palette would be modern in nature that would not relate well to surrounding properties having a detrimental effect on the character of the area.
8. The proposed development would be a discordant structure that would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the LECA, the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (LP), Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (CS), Policies DMD37 and DMD44 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) and the Framework which seeks development to conserve and enhance heritage assets, achieve high quality and maintain and improve the quality of the built and open environment.
9. My attention has been drawn to a number of other developments including schemes at Old Park Ridings¹, 113 Bullsmoor Lane² and 44 Compton Road³. Insufficient information has been provided in respect of these cases and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal scheme, particularly with regards to location and effect on the LECA. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
10. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case including the planning history to the site, discussions and correspondence with various Council Officers and the Conservation Action Group assessment. These matters however do not alter my findings above.

Other matters

11. The proposal would result in the loss of the builder's storage space and would be an efficient and effective use of previously developed land that would contribute to the local housing supply. The scheme would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would provide suitable amenity space for future occupiers of the development. The appeal site is in an accessible location to local services and would provide car parking spaces and cycle racks. It is also noted that the appellant considers that sustainable drainage system could be subject of suitable planning conditions. These matters and benefits however do not outweigh the harm I have identified in the main issue.

Conclusion

12. I conclude that for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference Number: 18/01991/FUL

² Local Planning Authority Reference Number: 18/04453/FUL

³ Local Planning Authority Reference Number: 18/00664/FUL