



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3231511

52A Abbotshall Avenue, Southgate, N14 7JX

- 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 Andreas Ionnanou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 18/01331/FUL, dated 12 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 4 bedroom detached house, incorporating the relocation of existing electricity sub station and providing new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbours; and,
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the adjacent pair of semi-detached houses and street scene.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The site comprises land to the side of 52 Abbotshall Avenue. The appeal site lies to the south of 52, and so the proposed development would restrict sunlight to its rear garden. The rear garden is small in comparison to other properties in the street and the siting of a two-storey house with a rear dormer in its place, would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 52. The rear garden would be overshadowed for much of the day, and the massing and close proximity of the new house would result in harm to the outlook from the rear garden, which at present is relatively open due to the low boundary treatment to the southern boundary.
4. In addition, I note that one of the flank windows to 52 serves the kitchen area of the house. While this is stated to be an open plan kitchen-diner with a window in the rear elevation serving the diner area, there would be little separation between the existing and proposed houses. On the basis of the evidence before me the other windows in the flank elevation serve non-

habitable rooms. However, the loss of light to, and outlook from, the kitchen window would be harmful.

5. I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 52 Abbotshall Avenue. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies DMD 8 and DMD 10 of the Development Management Document November 2014 (the DMD), Core Policy 4 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 November 2010 (the CS) and policy 3.5 of the London Plan March 2016 (the LP), which when taken together seek to ensure that new development does not cause harm to the living conditions of existing residents.

Character and appearance

6. The proposed house would be similar in style and appearance to the neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses at 52 and 50. It would feature a bay window to the front elevation, similar in some respects to the paired bay windows which are a distinctive feature of each pair of semi-detached houses along the even-numbered side of the road. The proposed house would also have a gable-ended roof.
7. The pairs of houses along this side of the road are generally characterised by their hipped roofs, although in some instances extensions have turned the roofs of one or both houses in each pair into gable-ended roofs. Hipped roofs remain in the majority, however, and combined with the prominence of the appeal site at the end of the row of houses on this side of the road it would appear incongruous in the street scene. The proposed bay window would also appear incongruous, as this feature links each pair of semi-detached houses along this side of the road, and would not serve the same purpose on a detached house.
8. In addition, each pair of existing houses is separated from the next by a significant gap, maintaining a sense of spaciousness within the street scene and preventing a terracing effect. The separation between 52 and the proposed development would be significantly less than between the other neighbouring properties in the street. It would be out of keeping with the established pattern of development, and would give the adjacent semi-detached pair an unduly cramped appearance.
9. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the adjacent pair of semi-detached houses and the street scene, contrary to policy DMD 37 of the DMD, Core Policy 30 of the CS and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the LP, which when taken together seek to ensure that new residential development is appropriately located, sized, and designed having regard to the pattern and grain of existing spaces.

Other matters

10. My attention has been drawn to a previous appeal decision on this site¹ which proposed a new house as an extension to 52 to form a terrace of 3 houses. There are some similarities between the proposals, and I note that my colleague concluded in that case that the proposed house would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. However, this is a different proposal, and as detailed above I find that there would be harm to the

¹ Ref: APP/Q5300/A/14/2228166

character and appearance of the area in this case. Each appeal must in any case be assessed on its own merits, which I have done here.

11. The development would contribute towards the local housing supply. However, I have not been provided with any evidence that there is a shortfall in the local supply, nor that there is a particular demand for the type of housing proposed here. I have therefore only accorded this limited weight in determining this appeal. This benefit would not outweigh the harm identified.
12. The appellant argues that the proposed development would not conflict with several Local Plan policies. However, the Local Plan must be taken as a whole, and conflict with requirements of a number of local policies does exist as set out above. In my judgement, the lack of conflict with some policies in this case does not outweigh the harm where conflict does exist and, on balance, the scheme conflicts with the Development Plan taken as a whole.
13. The appellant has referred to a lack of statutory objections to the proposed development. While I have afforded this some weight in determining this appeal, it does not outweigh the harm that has been identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR