

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/16/3151344

2a Green Dragon Lane, London 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 16/01273/FUL, dated 17 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.
 - Whether the proposal provides adequate car parking provision and the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached property in mixed use, including a children's nursery and flat on the ground floor and a further flat on the first floor. It lies in a very prominent and exposed position at the junction where Bush Hill, Ridge Avenue and Green Dragon Lane meet. There is a sense of spaciousness to the side of the property and around the junction that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the locality and provides views of mature street trees within Bush Hill. The area surrounding the appeal site is a mixture of residential and commercial properties of a varied appearance, form and size.
 4. The use of sympathetic materials and windows would reflect the appearance of the host property. However, because of the combination of the site's prominence, the scale, form and height of the extensions, in such close proximity to the side boundary with Bush Hill, it would result in the introduction of a prominent addition that would appear cramped on the site and unduly dominant in the streetscene. It would be an incongruous form of development
-

that would partially block views of mature trees currently visible within Bush Hill, substantially diminishing the perception of space on this side of the street.

5. The design also includes a number of different roof forms that would be clearly conspicuous on the approach from Ridge Avenue and with noticeably steeper roof pitches than the host property. Furthermore, it would also contain large number of windows in the side elevation that would sit adjacent to a blank expanse of brickwork. This would represent a somewhat awkward roof configuration and appearance that would be unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property and the existing pair. Although the appellant considers that it would improve the appearance of the existing building, in my view, it would not represent a high standard of design.
6. Whilst I do not share the Council's view that the combination of uses would be out of character with the area, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011 ('LP'), Policies 4 and 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 ('CS') and Policies DMD6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 37 and 38 of the Development Management Document 2014 ('DMD'). When taken together, these policies require development to be of a high quality design, appropriate to the existing pattern of development, of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing and have no adverse visual impact.

Parking provision and highway safety

7. The submitted plans do not show the extent of the proposed parking provision and it is unclear how many spaces would be provided within the front curtilage of the property and how they would be laid out. Moreover, I am not persuaded that satisfactory access to such spaces could be achieved given the lack of a dropped kerb from Green Dragon Lane, the presence of double yellow lines immediately outside the appeal site and the apparent lack of sufficient space to access the spaces from the existing dropped kerb on Bush Hill.
8. In my judgement, although cycle parking provision could be achieved by condition, the proposal fails to demonstrate adequate parking provision and access and that it would not harm highway safety. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 6.13 of the LP and Policies 8, 45 and 46 of the DMD which, amongst other things, requires new developments to provide adequate access and parking and that parking layouts meet all manoeuvring requirements.

Other Matters

9. The Council's third reason for refusal refers to the fact that insufficient information has been provided to justify an absence of financial contributions towards affordable housing and associated monitoring fees. Whilst I note the appellant's view that such contributions are no longer required following a recent Court of Appeal judgement, because I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further.
10. The provision of one additional dwelling, even in an area of high demand for housing and the fact that there would be no effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host property and area.

11. Whilst I note the appellant's concerns in relation to the handling of the application, the Council's administration and determination of the application is not a matter for me to address as part of this appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having considered all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole and I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR