



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2021

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3262334

1 Mitchell Road, Southgate N13 6EG

- 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 Hamid Kamyab (KIKS Group Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 20/02812/HOU, dated 2 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a ground floor side and rear extension, first floor side extension, insertion of roof windows and new front door canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a ground floor side and rear extension, first floor side extension, insertion of roof windows and new front door canopy at 1 Mitchell Road, Southgate N13 6EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02812/HOU, dated 2 September 2020, subject to the following 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: EGA 001; EGA 002; EGA 003; PGA 001; PGA 002; PGA 003 and Site Location Plan.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the junction of Mitchell Road and Chequers Way. By reason of its location, the property is sited within the larger plot than similarly designed dwellings fronting Mitchell Road. Within the surrounding area there are a mix of houses, purpose built apartment buildings and employment buildings associated with a dairy. To the north of the property is Ostliffe Road, beyond which is the A406 North Circular Road, and to the west is a large tarmac surfaced area of

- highway land which is used for parking and as a waiting area for buses. By reason of its location, the property occupies a visually prominent corner plot.
4. The proposed development includes the erection of single and 2-storey extensions to the side and rear of the property. By reason of the plot's size, these extensions would not be of a scale or footprint to represent an overdevelopment of the property's curtilage for use as a single dwelling house. The resulting property would be proportionate to the size of this prominent corner plot rather than be an incongruous form of development.
 5. The proposed side extension would respect the building line along Mitchell Road and the enlarged property's elevations would be set away from the boundaries, including with Chequers Way, to maintain the appearance of a spacious plot. Rather than being visually intrusive, the streetscenes along Mitchell Road and Chequers Way would not be materially changed by the resulting property that significant harm would be caused to their character and appearance.
 6. Further, because of the design of the 2-storey side extension it would appear a subservient addition to the host property, including by reason of a lower ridge level and the first floor elevation being set back from the property's frontage. The subservience of the side extension, together with the hipped roof form and fenestration, would not unacceptably unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings.
 7. A single storey addition has already been erected to the rear of 3 Mitchell Road. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a similar depth to create a common alignment with No. 3, including when viewed from Ostliffe Road.
 8. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy CP30 of Enfield's Core Strategy 2010-2025 (CS) and Policies DMD 11 and DMD 37 of Enfield's Development Management Document (DMD). Amongst other matters, and in addition to requirements for side extensions, these policies require proposals to improve the quality of the built environment, including by reference to taking into account the nature of the surrounding area and promoting high quality development of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing. CS Policy CP4 and DMD Policies DMD 6 and DMD 8 are not of direct relevance to the appeal scheme because they concern new residential development rather than alterations to a dwelling.

Conditions

9. The Council has not suggested conditions in the event this appeal succeeds. However, and taking into account the tests in the Planning Practice Guidance, conditions are necessary for reasons of precision to ensure that the approved development is erected in accordance with the submitted drawings and the external material match those of the host property (as identified on the application form). Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR