
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

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

Decision date: 24 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3167469
388 Southbury Road, Enfield EN3 4JJ

- 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 John Burgess against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/04053/FUL, dated 3 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a one-bedroom bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It appears that the proposal has changed since the Council considered the application in that the car parking space for the bungalow has now been re-allocated to No 388. I therefore sought further information to clarify the site ownership, car parking and rights of access. An updated site plan has been submitted and it is clear that the development would not have a dedicated off-street car parking space. Although this changes the proposal, the Council has commented on the lack of dedicated off-street parking in its appeal statement and I am satisfied that interested parties would not be prejudiced as a result of the clarification. Therefore, I have taken the updated plan into account in my consideration of the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on: (i) the character and appearance of the area and; (ii) highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site comprises the former rear garden of No 388 Southbury Road, which has been extended to the side to create a separate dwelling known as No 388A. The site is located on the corner with Glyn Road, which contains two pairs of semi-detached houses. The area is characterised by semi-detached or terraced houses with spacious rear gardens.
 5. The proposed development is a modest bungalow that would be accessed via Glyn Road. There would be a small area of garden to the front of the bungalow containing a bin store and space for cycle parking.
-

6. The bungalow would be of a relatively small scale in comparison with the surrounding development. Despite its modest size and scale, it would dominate the plot with almost no space to the sides and rear, and only a small garden to the front. The development would appear cramped due to the constrained size of the plot, which would not be consistent with the predominant form of development in the area. This cramped appearance would be accentuated by the bin and cycle store, and the retained right of access at the side. Moreover, the bungalow would appear incongruous in the area as it would not reflect the prevailing pattern of semi-detached and terraced houses. The appellant refers to other varied forms of development in the vicinity which I saw during my site visit. However, the development would be seen in the context of the houses on Glyn Road and at the junction of Southbury Road, and it would not reflect their design and form.
7. The appellant refers to a previous appeal on the site. However, the full balance of considerations that informed that decision is not before me and I am unable to assess whether that proposal was comparable to this appeal. Consequently, I give the appeal decision little weight.
8. The appellant has also supplied photographs that show bungalows adjoining houses. It is difficult to me to assess the site-specific circumstances from the evidence provided and it is not clear when the bungalows were built or the size of the plots.
9. Copies of planning permissions and corresponding site plans for two redevelopment proposals have been submitted by the appellant. These schemes appear to relate to former garage sites and it has not been explained how these proposals are comparable to the appeal proposal.
10. Consequently, I find that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy,¹ which seeks to ensure that development maintains and improves the quality of the built environment, and Policies DMD6, DMD7, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document² which, in combination, seek to ensure development is of a high-quality design and of a scale and form that respects the existing pattern of development.

Highway Safety

11. The further information supplied by the appellant has clarified the parking arrangement and right of access. A right of way would be retained at the side of the bungalow to allow vehicular access to the parking space for No 388, which is located at the rear of that property. No additional vehicular cross-over would be required.
12. Although the application indicates that a car parking space would be provided, this would be on the shared driveway, which would prevent access to the car parking space for No 388. Consequently, the development could not provide an off-street car parking space, as required by the Council.
13. I saw from my site visit that on-street parking in the area is limited, in particular on Glyn Road, and there is a school / day nursery in close proximity

¹ Enfield Council Local Development Framework: Core Strategy 2010-2025 'The Enfield Plan', adopted November 2010

² Enfield Council Development Management Document (DMD) 'Improving Enfield', adopted November 2014

to the site. It is likely that any car parking on Glyn Road, either by future occupants or their visitors, would lead to conflict between highway users, especially at school drop-off and collection times. Although there is a car park nearby, it is not clear whether this provides free parking and, in any event, future occupants are more likely to park as close as possible to their home. I appreciate that the site is well located for access to services and alternative forms of transport, but it has not been demonstrated that car free development in this location would be justified.

14. The Council is concerned about pedestrian visibility. I saw that pedestrian visibility is restricted by panel fencing either side of the access. However, the development would not affect the existing access or visibility splay as this is already in use to serve the occupants of No 388.
15. In conclude on this issue, I find that it has not been demonstrated that the development would not have an adverse effect on traffic flows or highway safety. Consequently, the development would accord with Policy CP25 of the Core Strategy and Policies DMD45 and DMD47 of the Development Management Document, which seek to ensure safe and suitable access for all people.

Conclusion

16. I appreciate that the development would make a very small contribution to the housing supply, and the bungalow may contribute to local housing need. However, these limited benefits do not outweigh the harm as set out above.
17. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector