
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/16/3164509

Longridge, 5 Quakers Walk, Southgate N21 2DE

- 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 Theo Theodosiou, GT Associates against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/01575/FUL, dated 13 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 3 new detached 5 bedroom houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a cul de sac in a predominantly residential area. The street is characterised by large, mainly two storey dwellings, set back within spacious and verdant grounds, with front boundaries strongly delineated by walls and planting.
 4. Though two storey dwellings predominate within the cul de sac, there is a pronounced variation in architecture, including the existing bungalow on the appeal site and a taller and narrower tower structure that appears to have been converted to residential use. However these forms of development are the exception and in any event do not disrupt the uniform sense of generous spacing between buildings which opens up attractive views of mature woodland planting in the background.
 5. Whilst the proposed introduction of taller dwellings would generally have greater affinity with the height of neighbouring properties, when compared with the existing bungalow, the proposal for three units would significantly increase the density of built development on the site. The siting of the units would maximise use of the extensive plot width, with relatively limited gaps between one another whilst eroding the existing sense of spaciousness between neighbouring buildings. In addition the roofs of the proposed dwellings would
-

appear very bulky, sloping at a markedly steeper angle and with a higher ridgeline compared to neighbouring properties.

6. In combination these factors would result in the proposed dwellings having a somewhat regimented, dominant and imposing presence within the street, at odds with the more informal and recessive character of existing dwellings there.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015; Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010; Policies DMD 6, DMD 8 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as they seek to promote good design, appropriate to the character of its surroundings in terms of density, scale, form and pattern.

Conclusion

8. Taking into account the above, I am firmly of the view that providing additional housing in a time of need would not outweigh the design shortcomings of the scheme. Accordingly, the proposal in this case does not amount to sustainable development and the presumption in favour of such, as set out in the Framework, does not apply.
9. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR