
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3174281

Land to rear of 56 Raynham Road, London N18 2JF

- 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 L Lawry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/00033/FUL, dated 21 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of new single storey, one bedroom, one person dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal upon;
 - i) the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 54 Raynham Road and the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the former rear garden area of 56 Raynham Road, and is currently an overgrown and unkempt site featuring a flat roofed outbuilding, bounded by a brick and concrete wall to Raynham Avenue. The area has an urban residential character being sited just off the North Circular Road, and features predominantly two storey terraced housing stock with school grounds opposing the site.
4. The appeal proposal seeks consent for a single storey one bedroom dwelling house following demolition of the outbuilding. The proposal would be rectangular in shape, set behind the build line of dwellings on Raynham Avenue and would feature a shallow dual pitched roof and new boundary wall.
5. An Inspector dismissed an appeal (APP/Q5300/W/15/3134218) for a similar proposal at this site last year, and I consider this decision is a significant material consideration.

Character and appearance

6. The scale and the siting of the dwelling behind the build line of Raynham Avenue, and the use of a pitched roof has attempted to overcome elements of the previous Inspector's findings on character and appearance. I also appreciate the appellant's intention to use reclaimed London stock bricks and a slate roof.
7. Nevertheless, due to its squat single storey height, lack of detailing and extremely shallow roof pitch, the overall design of the proposal lacks architectural style and quality. I find that it would not successfully integrate with the surrounding residential dwellings, appearing inappropriate in its context.
8. Furthermore, even when noting the current overgrown condition of the site and the existing building, the proposal would still remove the site's function as a spacious and open break between existing properties; a point on which I concur with the previous Inspector.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area, failing to comply with the relevant parts of Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (November 2014) (DMD), Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (November 2010) (CS), and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (March 2016) (LP). These policies seek, amongst other things, high quality design and to ensure that development successfully integrates with the existing form of development.

Living conditions

10. The boundaries of the site to neighbouring dwellings consist of timber panel fencing of around 1.8m in height. Unlike the previous appeal, which featured a flat roof; the proposed roof design would be pitched, with the eaves sited along the side boundary to 54 Raynham Road. Whilst the width remains similar to the previous proposal, due to the existing boundary treatment height, the modest eaves height and shallow pitched roof; I find that the effect upon No 54 would lead to no undue sense of enclosure, which is not contrary to the Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the DMD, Core Policy 30 of the CS and Policy 7.4 of the LP, in so far as they seek to protect amenity.
11. There are no windows proposed in the side elevation, leading to limited concerns in relation to overlooking of the dwelling house. However, the proposed private amenity space would be located to the side, adjacent to 56 Raynham Road. Due to the existing boundary treatment, there would be little overlooking to the proposed amenity space from the ground floor windows of No 56. At first floor, the rear outrigger extension contains an obscure glazed window that would prevent overlooking. However, the first floor window in the rear elevation of No 56 would directly overlook the proposed private amenity space. Whilst partially screened due to the outrigger and boundary treatment, I find that a significant amount of garden would still be clearly visible, which is in part due to the short depth of No 56's rear garden. The effect would be such that future occupiers would be subject to unacceptable levels of overlooking.
12. Therefore, whilst I find that the proposal would have an acceptable effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 54 Raynham Road, I find that the

degree of overlooking from 56 Raynham Road towards the private amenity space of the proposed dwelling would be unacceptable. This would be in conflict with the relevant parts of Policies DMD8, DMD9 and DMD10 of the DMD, which seek to preserve amenity.

Other matters

13. I observed the single storey school building that opposes the site, and noted the appellant's submission that this proposal would be similar. However, this building is sited in an entirely different context, being within the grounds of a school, and features a taller pitched roof and traditional architectural detailing. Therefore, I find limited similarities to the scheme before me.
14. I have taken note that the proposal would provide the opportunity to bring forward alternative and lower priced accommodation to the market, attracting a new person into the area who may positively contribute to the economy. Furthermore, I also noted the existing building and the unkempt nature of the site, and that the proposals would clear up the site, upgrade the boundary wall and pavement, and remove the steel gates; and that there have been no objections from neighbouring residents or consultees from other Council departments. None of the other matters outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area or future living conditions.

Conclusion

15. Having had regard to all other matters raised, and for the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR