
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by Claire Victory BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/17/3179065
463-465 Hertford Road, Enfield, EN3 5UT

- 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 Elitok Properties Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/01476/FUL, dated 31 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is studio flat in roof space, increase in height to form a crown roof, rear dormer, front rooflights and external staircase to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref 17/01775/FUL) on this site. That appeal is subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the subject terrace and surrounding area; and
 - Whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers with regard to private amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Nos 463-465 Hertford Road is a two storey building at the northern end of a terrace of eight properties. The ground floor is occupied by a supermarket and the first floor is in residential use. The appeal site is located on the corner of Hertford Road and East Road. Hertford Road is mixed in character, with residential properties interspersed with commercial uses, while East Road is a minor side road comprising small terraced properties.
 5. The main part of the appeal property has a shallow hipped roof and there is a two storey element at the rear with a steeper front to back pitched roof. Some other properties in the subject terrace have a similar roof formation that can be seen from East Road.
-

6. The appeal proposal would extend the main roof to the rear and would raise the ridge height by approximately 0.5 metres to create a crown roof. Although there are some slight variations in ridge heights across the subject terrace, the appeal dwelling would be noticeably greater in height than the adjoining property with which it shares a chimney stack. As a result the proposed extension would appear incongruous with the remainder of the subject terrace and would have a harmfully jarring effect when viewed from Hertford Road.
7. The Council has described the appeal property as 3 terrace units, but from my observations at the site visit, the two storey element of the property broadly equates to two similar properties in the terrace, with a somewhat narrower single storey flat roof side projection. I also accept that there are some other taller buildings within the locality including an apartment block under construction on the opposite side of the road, and that there is some variety in the roof forms of nearby buildings. Nevertheless, the excessive depth of the extended roof, in combination with the increased ridge height would result in an unacceptably bulky appearance that would be visible from East Road and Hertford Road when looking south.
8. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the subject terrace and surrounding area. Thus it would conflict with Policies DMD8, DMD13 and DMD37 of the Development Management Document (DMD) (2014), and Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy (CS) (2010), which require proposals to be sympathetic in scale and form with the existing pattern of development.

Living Conditions

9. In total 3.6 square metres of private amenity space would be provided for the proposed studio flat. This would just fall short of the 4 square metres required by Section A of DMD Policy DM9 for a 1 bedroom 1 person unit. However this part of the policy only applies where communal space is to be provided within the development, and Section B of the policy does not set a minimum requirement for private amenity space for residential units of this size in schemes where there is no communal amenity space.
10. The space would be split across two terraces, each comprising approximately 1.8 square metres in area, with a narrow width of about 1m. The configuration of the space would therefore be awkward, but would still allow occupants outdoor space to sit out, hang washing out or to allow space for plants. Furthermore, as the studio flat would be on the second floor, it would not be overlooked by neighbouring properties.
11. Taking all of the above into account, I conclude that the proposal would provide satisfactory living accommodation for future occupants, in respect of private amenity space. Thus the proposal would accord with DMD policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD9 and DMD39 and CS Policy CP4, which require development to provide good quality amenity space that is not significantly overlooked by surrounding development.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the development would provide satisfactory living accommodation for future occupiers, but this would be outweighed by the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the subject terrace and surrounding area.
13. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Claire Victory
INSPECTOR