



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: 19 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3254371

2A Green Dragon Lane, Southgate N21 2LD

- 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 S Joannou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/00235/FUL, dated 13 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single, part two storey side/rear extension to facilitate a change from a 1 x 1 bed to a 1 x 2 bed dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a part single, part two storey side/rear extension to facilitate a change from a 1 x 1 bed to a 1 x 2 bed dwelling at 2A Green Dragon Lane, Southgate N21 2LD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00235/FUL, dated 13 January 2020, 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: Site Location Plan; Existing & Proposed Ground Floor Plans; Existing & Proposed First Floor Plans; Existing & Proposed Second Floor Plans; Existing Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2); Existing Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2); Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2); Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2); Existing & Proposed Sections; Existing & Proposed Site Plans; Proposed Front Elevation Comparison with Refused Application Front.
 - 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.
 - 4) Before the development hereby approved is occupied details of all hardstanding shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the hardstanding shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details
 - 5) Before the development hereby approved is occupied details of refuse storage facilities including design and siting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the refuse storage facility shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

- 6) Before the development hereby approved is occupied details, including elevation details, for covered cycle parking for the storage of a minimum of 3 bicycles, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the cycle parking storage shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details, prior to the occupation of the development.

Procedural Matter

2. For the sake of clarity and brevity I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of residential and commercial buildings. The appeal building sits on a prominent corner plot, particularly when viewed from Green Dragon Road and Ridge Avenue. The buildings in the area are varied in styles and architectural designs. It is this variation in the built form which contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. The scale and bulk of the proposed development would be sensitive in nature and not appear as an overly dominant structure. The attached neighbouring property has differing features to the appeal property, including a front dormer window, and therefore the proposed development would not adversely affect the symmetry or rhythm of the buildings.
6. Due to the design of the proposed development, including fenestration which would be similar to the existing fenestration on the building, it would not be out of keeping with the architectural style or original features of the area. The proposal would be set back from the main roads and would retain a sense of spaciousness.
7. The proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal complies with Policy 30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010, Policies DMD6, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Plan 2014 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 which seeks development to be of the highest architectural quality and maintain and improve the quality of the built environment.
8. I have had regard to the Council's statement of case and officer report including two previous planning refusals and dismissed planning appeal. However, insufficient information has been provided in respect of these cases and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, particularly with regards to size, design and form. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
9. The Council have referred to unauthorised development at the appeal site including a terrace, rear dormer and access which are not reflected on the submitted plans. It has also been indicated that the appeal site consists of a nursery, 1 x 1 and 1 x 4 bedroom units which the Council consider to be

established units. I have given careful consideration to these matters however, they do not alter my findings above.

Conditions

10. The conditions imposed are mostly those which have been suggested by the Council. In the interests of precision and clarity I have undertaken some minor editing and rationalisation.
11. Conditions relating to timeliness and the identification of plans are necessary in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is imposed in relation to materials. Conditions are imposed in relation to hard standing, cycle parking and refuse storage which are necessary in the interests of drainage, waste collection and promotion of sustainable travel.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR