



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3228791

45 Highfield Road, Southgate N21 3HD

- 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 K Swarnaprabha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/00293/HOU, dated 24 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as outbuilding at rear (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application form indicates that the development was completed in November 2018. At the time of my site visit the building was substantially complete with the base, walls, roof, doors and windows all present. I have therefore determined this appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the outbuilding on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-terrace house, part of a row of semi-detached and terraced houses of matching character and similar garden sizes. Several of these houses have outbuildings in their rear gardens. Highfield Road is mainly residential in character, with a school a short distance from the appeal site.
5. The outbuilding that is the subject of this appeal is sited at the far end of the rear garden of no 45. It has a dual-pitched, gable-ended roof. Each side wall is only separated from the adjacent boundary fence by a short distance. It is substantially taller than the boundary fences with the neighbouring properties, which are of a typically uniform height for several properties in either direction.
6. My attention has been drawn to the existence of other outbuildings in the wider area around the appeal site. Outbuildings in neighbouring gardens that I observed during my site visit appeared to be of varied character. Whilst I have not been provided with any details of their planning status, in each case they appeared smaller and lower in height than the appeal development. Their

presence was clearly that of being subservient outbuildings which were proportionate to the garden of their relevant host property. However, as I do not have any details of the planning history of these outbuildings, their presence can only be given limited weight in determining this appeal. In any event each appeal must be determined on its own individual merits and this is what I have done in this case.

7. The outbuilding that is the subject of this appeal is significantly larger than any outbuilding in the immediately neighbouring properties due to its width and much greater height. I have no doubt that it is a prominent feature in the area when viewed from neighbouring properties, as its size makes it an unduly dominant feature in the garden of the host dwelling. It does not have the character and appearance of a subservient outbuilding. As a consequence of its size, siting and dominance it harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. For these reasons the outbuilding is contrary to policy DM12 of the Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) (adopted November 2014) which requires that outbuildings be of an appropriate height and bulk so as not to adversely impact on the character of the local area. The appeal development also conflicts with policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010-2025 and policies DM8 and DM37 of the DMD which collectively seek new development to be of a high standard of design in keeping with established local character. Conflict also arises with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (March 2016) which refers to the need for development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

M Chalk

Inspector