



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2024

by J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3336856

9, Gleams, Cannon Hill, Southgate, Enfield N14 7DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andreas Kontoyiannis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 23/02532/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor extension 4 metres from existing building rear wall and together first floor extension 3 metres from existing building rear wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor extension 4 metres from existing building rear wall and together first floor extension 3 metres from existing building rear wall at 9, Gleams, Cannon Hill, Southgate, Enfield N14 7DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02532/HOU, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that the address is "Gleams", whereas the appeal form states that the address is "The Gleams". It has been confirmed in correspondence with the appellant that the correct address is "Gleams".
3. Copies of the listings for 2, 4, and 6 Cannon Hill (Nos 2, 4, and 6), and the Southgate Green Conservation Area, Management Proposals, February 2015 (CA Management Proposals) were requested but not provided. The CA Management Proposals document has been explicitly referred to within representations and the fact that Nos 2, 4, and 6 are Grade II listed has also been referenced. Therefore, neither party is prejudiced by me considering these documents when making my decision.
4. Two previous applications¹ to extend the appeal property were refused in January and July 2022. The second decision was appealed, and that appeal² was dismissed. This appeal proposal is an amended scheme and does not include any works to the front of the property, unlike previous proposals.
5. As the appeal site is in the Southgate Green Conservation Area (CA), I have had special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 1990 Act).

¹ Planning application Refs. 21/04270/HOU and 22/01271/HOU

² Appeal Ref. APP/Q5300/D/22/3307045

Main Issues

6. The Council has confirmed in writing that the second reason for refusal was erroneously added to the Decision Notice. No interested parties have raised concerns with the effect of the proposal on nearby trees. Therefore, this does not form part of the main issues of the appeal.
7. Although the reasons for refusal do not refer to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, within the Delegated Report the Council indicated that the proposal would be overbearing. As such, this forms part of the main issues of the appeal.
8. Taking the above into account, the main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of 7 and 11 Cannon Hill (Nos 7 and 11), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Conservation area

9. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal³ (the CCA) indicates that the CA's significance is linked to the rapid expansion of the area, transforming Southgate Green from a small rural village in the early 20th Century to the centre of an extensive residential suburb. Nevertheless, the area has managed to superficially retain its village character. The appeal property is a relatively unaltered 1950s 'infill' property located between two larger properties and this pattern of development is reflective of the historic expansion of the area.
10. Given the above, I find that the significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily associated with the time depth evidenced by its buildings. In addition, the wide grass verge, tall trees, and glimpsed views of the rear gardens, between the properties, create a verdant appearance. These factors contribute to the suburban character of this part of the CA.
11. The proposed rear extensions would be a significant addition to the appeal property. A lack of articulation to the flank walls would ensure that the extensions do not appear subservient to the original property. However, the form, scale and massing of the extended property would still maintain the existing pattern of development, as it would still be viewed as a smaller infill dwelling. Also, the extended section of the property would not appear disproportionate when viewed in context with its spacious grounds. Furthermore, whilst the proposed extensions would not read as subservient additions to the appeal property, it is not a policy requirement of either Policy DMD6 or DMD11 of the Improving Enfield, Development Management Document, November 2014 (DMD).
12. There is currently significant separation between the appeal property and its neighbours, Nos 7 and 11. In particular, there is a large gap between the appeal property and No 11. Although the rear extensions would project into the garden, the visual gaps between the properties would not be materially affected given their extensive width. Once constructed there would still be

³ Southgate Green Conservation Area Enfield, Character Appraisal, London Borough of Enfield, The Paul Drury Partnership

glimpsed views of the rear gardens. Also, vegetation in front of the property would be unaffected; as such, the verdant appearance of the area would be preserved.

13. The appeal proposal includes the alteration and extension of the roof which would result in a crown roof and the construction of three dormers. Whilst the proposal would significantly increase the massing of the roof, the design of the roof would be reflective of aspects of the front elevation, and there are numerous examples of large dormers in proximity to the appeal site, and No 11 has a similar roof form. As such, the proposed roof form, scale and massing would assimilate into the existing roofscape.
14. When considered as a whole, the proposed development would lead to a significantly extended property. Notwithstanding this, the form, scale and massing of the extended property would preserve the prevailing pattern of development and maintain the suburban character of the area. Moreover, the proposed extensions are to the rear of the property and would therefore have a limited effect on the street scene. As the proposal does not alter the detailing on the front elevation and preserves the pattern of development, it would not alter the time depth evidenced by the appeal property and its neighbours.
15. Although the application form contains some information, the application plans do not contain details of the proposed materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extensions or specifications for the proposed fenestration. Nevertheless, these details could be secured by condition attached to any planning permission.
16. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would comply with Policies CP30 and CP31 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy 2010-2025, November 2010 (CS), Policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021 (LP), and DMD Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD13, DMD37, and DMD44. These policies indicate that development proposals affecting heritage assets should conserve their significance, the Council will ensure that built development that has an impact on heritage assets have regard to their special character, and development will be permitted where the scale and form is appropriate to the existing pattern of development, amongst other matters.
17. Moreover, it would be in accordance with paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which indicates that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. It would also be in accordance with the guidance contained within the CCA and the CA Management Proposals where they advise that one of the key threats to the CA is the loss of the historic grain and that buildings which make a positive contribution to the CA should utilise traditional materials.

Living conditions

18. The appeal property is well separated from both Nos 7 and 11. The building line of this section of the road is slightly curved, which leads to parts of the front elevation of the appeal property projecting forward of the front elevation of No 11. All of the properties along this section of Cannon Hill front onto the road.

19. The proposed extensions would be large but would not project beyond the rear elevation of No 7 and would only project a short distance beyond the rear elevation of No 11. There are windows in the side elevations of the neighbouring properties, which would look directly toward the extended appeal property. However, they are set back from the boundary and most of the neighbouring properties' windows face toward their own rear and front gardens. Although the proposed rear extensions would project beyond the rear elevation of No 11, there is ample separation between the properties.
20. The proposed extensions would largely be in angled views from neighbouring properties. The extended property would also appear smaller than neighbouring properties and the extensions would not reduce the separation between these properties. As such, the proposal would not be overbearing.
21. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of Nos 7 and 11, with particular regard to outlook. The proposal would comply with DMD Policies DMD8 and DMD11 which indicate that new residential development, including rear extensions, will be permitted where it preserves amenities in terms of outlook, amongst other matters.

Other Matters

22. The appeal property is in proximity to the Grade II listed properties Nos 2, 4, and 6⁴. Section 66(1) of the 1990 Act requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings, or their setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. The significance of these listed buildings includes their traditional architecture and the historic setting of Cannon Hill.
23. As above, the proposed development would preserve the prevailing pattern of development. The proposal would not directly affect Nos 2, 4 and 6, and views of the proposed extensions from these properties would be very limited, due to the presence of intervening development. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the listed buildings, their setting, and any features of special or historic interest that they possess.

Conditions

24. The Council has indicated the conditions that it considers would be appropriate. I have considered these in light of the guidance contained within the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework.
25. Conditions specifying a time limit to implement the permission and approved plans are required in the interest of certainty. A condition requiring details of the external finishes to be approved by the local planning authority are required in the interest of character and appearance.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed and planning permission is granted.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR

⁴ List Entry Nos 1359007, 1188646, and 1078904

SCHEDULE OF 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 drawing nos 401/00, 401/11, 401/12A, 401/13A, 401/14, and 401/15A.
- 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.