



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 September 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3275119

12A The Green, Southgate N14 7EH

- 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 Darran Carlisle against the decision of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/00192/HOU, dated 20 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension, 2 hipped dormers to the rear roof slope, new skylights and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension, 2 hipped dormers to the rear roof slope, new skylights and associated alterations at 12A The Green, Southgate N14 7EH in accordance with the application, Ref 21/00192/HOU, dated 20 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Location Plan; Block Plan Drawing Number 132 EX007; Existing Floor Plans 132 EX001; Existing Floor Plans 132 EX002; Existing Elevations Drawing Number 132 EX003; Existing Elevations Drawing Number 132 EX004; Existing Sections Drawing Number 132 EX005; Existing Site Elevations Drawing Number 132 EX006; Proposed Floor Plans Drawing Number 132 GA001; Proposed Floor Plans Drawing Number 132 GA002; Proposed Elevations Drawing Number 132 GA003; Proposed Elevations Drawing Number 132 GA004; Proposed Sections Drawing Number 132 GA005; Proposed Site Elevations Drawing Number 132 GA006 and Proposed Detail Elevation Drawing Number 132 GA007.
 - 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. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and area including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Southgate Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The CA derives its significance from the area's development as a village centred on The Green, which has a spacious and semi-rural feel. Views along The Green are dominated by Christ Church with its spire drawing the eye.
4. Plots along The Green historically were individually developed. These individually designed detached properties are set within spacious settings resulting in a varied street scene. The presence of frontage trees and planting reinforces this village character.
5. Many properties within the street scene display dominant roof forms, and there is considerable variation in their configuration. I also noted during my site visit varying roof forms in the area.
6. Although the proposed development would increase the scale and form of the roof, it would have a negligible effect on the overall visual appearance of the host property. Whilst it would have a uniform height, the proposal would not be visually dominant but would rather complement the design and roof form of the host property.
7. Views of the host property, including those from The Green, would be localised and glimpsed due to the position of the dwelling, the distance from the highway and an intervening tree. In my judgement, the proposal would not have a materially greater visual impact on the surrounding area or diminish views of trees or Christ Church beyond.
8. I note the Council's comments in relation to the existing tree. However, it enjoys statutory protection due to it being located within the CA and is likely to remain in place for a considerable period. I therefore give this argument limited weight in coming to my decision.
9. Overall, the proposed development would not appear incongruous or detract from the character and appearance of the area taking into account the property variations I have identified.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and would preserve the significance of the CA. It would accord with Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Core Strategy (2010), Policies DMD13, DMD37 and DMD44 of the Development Management Document (2014) which, amongst other things, seek high quality and design led development that pay special regard to their character and context; roof extensions to be in keeping with the character of the property and are not dominant when viewed from the surrounding area and developments that preserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to its significance. It would also accord with the Southgate Green Conservation Area Character Appraisal.
11. It would accord with Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, seek development to respond to the existing character; be of high quality design and enhance heritage assets that contribute towards local character and conserve their significance. It would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

12. I have considered the imposition of conditions in accordance with the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal succeeds.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR