
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Elaine Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1st August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3170150
48 Waggon Road, Enfield, EN4 0PP

- 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 & Mrs Anastasiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 16/05720/FUL, dated 8 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a minor material amendment to rear roof to allow adequate height in second floor accommodation. Following the approved application for "demolition of existing dwelling, erection of 1 x 7 bed-single family dwelling, front and rear dormers and terrace at first floor level". 16/00705/FUL.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Anastasiou against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an existing two storey detached dwelling on the south side of Waggon Road. The surrounding area is characterised by similar large detached houses in a variety of styles with agricultural fields on the other side of Waggon Road to the north.
 5. The proposal seeks a minor amendment to planning permission 16/00705/FUL which has been granted for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a new detached house (which has not yet been built). The plans for that dwelling were originally submitted showing a large single crown roof, but were amended during the Council's consideration of the application to include two smaller crown roofs in order to reduce the bulk of the dwelling. The appellants now seek to revert to the originally proposed single crown roof in order to increase the head room in the second floor accommodation.
-

6. The proposal would increase the height of the rear part of the main permitted roof by 0.35 metres for a depth of around 1.8 metres. In practical terms it would make the rear part of the main roof the same height as the front part of the roof. I appreciate that the proposal would not increase the density of the approved development or its floor space. It would also introduce a more symmetrical and uniform roofline in comparison with the permitted stepped roof profile arising from the two crown roofs.
7. Even so, the resultant single crown roof would be large. The Council estimates that it would be around 7.8 metres wide and 5.2 metres deep overall. Whilst I appreciate that the proposed changes are described as minor amendments, in my view they would result in a much more substantial and bulky roof form.
8. Although the height of the front part of the roof would not be raised, the depth of the full height of the flat section of the front crown roof would be increased towards the rear of the house. This addition would be visible in views of the dwelling's side elevations from Waggon Road on approach to the site in both directions. The proposed alterations to the roof would also be seen from Duchy Road from where the increase in height on the rear elevation would also be evident. Since the land slopes downwards to the south towards the rear of the site, the proposed roof would be seen in an elevated position on approach along Duchy Road from the south.
9. The appeal site sits within a row of large detached houses west of Duchy Road. I appreciate that a number of the properties nearby have been demolished and re-built, but saw no other examples of crown roofs in this particular section of Waggon Road. Furthermore, although adjacent No 50 to the west of the appeal site is a substantial dwelling, neighbouring No 46 on the end of the row at its corner with Duchy Road is a much smaller and more modest property.
10. In this context, I consider that the enlarged single crown roof proposed would appear unduly big and dominant. It would introduce a more considerable and substantial single roof profile that would be uncharacteristic of the area and much larger than that at neighbouring No 46. As such, it would appear unsympathetic and visually intrusive and would detract from the character of the area. This being so, I am not convinced that the proposal would draw less attention to the building in comparison with the approved stepped roofline and more modest roof profile. That the site is not within a Conservation Area or the setting of a listed building does not alter my view.
11. I note the appellants' view that Waggon Road has very light pedestrian traffic and only has a footpath on the opposite side of the road from the appeal site. Additionally I am aware that there are no footpaths at all along that section of Duchy Road close to the appeal site. Even so, the site is visible from two public highways and I am not convinced that these factors would mean that the number of people who would be likely to view the proposal would be minimal. In any event, that would not be a reason to allow development that would be harmful.
12. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy which seeks to maintain and improve the quality of the built and open environment.

13. It would conflict with Policy 6 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) requires development to be of a density appropriate to the locality and to meet a number of criteria, including that the scale and form of development is appropriate to the existing pattern of development or setting, having regard to the character typologies (criterion a).
14. It would fail to support DMD Policy 8 which sets out general standards for new residential development and requires development to (amongst other things) be of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing (criterion b), and DMD Policy 37 which requires new development to (amongst other things) be appropriate to its context and have appropriate regard to its surroundings.
15. The proposal would be at odds with Policy 7.1 of the London Plan (D) which requires the design of new buildings and the spaces they create should help reinforce or enhance the character, legibility, permeability and accessibility of the neighbourhood. It would also conflict with London Plan Policy 7.4 (A) which states that development should have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings (A). Furthermore, it would undermine the core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to always seek to secure high quality design.

Other matters

16. Although the appellants cite the presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraphs 14 and paragraph 49 of the Framework, it has not been put to me that the development plan is absent, silent or out-of-date. In I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and contrary to the development plan. Thus, I do not consider it would contribute to protecting or enhancing our built environment as required by the environmental role of sustainable development. Consequently, I do not regard the proposal to be sustainable development.
17. The appellants also refer to paragraph 187 of the Framework which states that local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems. However, this is a matter between the appellants and the Council and I confirm that I have considered the appeal scheme on its own planning merits and made my own assessment as to its potential impacts.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Worthington

INSPECTOR