
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3239461
24 Kenilworth Crescent, Enfield EN1 3RE

- 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 John Oshibodu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 18/03443/FUL, dated 4 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as "the proposed subdivision of land and creation of one new residential unit"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the street scene within Kenilworth Crescent.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of an end of terrace property and a garden that, as a consequence of the corner location, is larger than those of the attached terraced properties. Houses on Kenilworth Crescent are generally set out in short terraces and the appeal site is situated on a corner where the road turns at a right angle.
4. The Council states that the proposed dwelling would project forwards of the building line. At the site visit I noted that the building line is clearly established by the adjacent terraces and is a characteristic of Kenilworth Crescent.
5. Furthermore, I observed at the site visit that the gable elevation of the appeal property is already clearly visible within the street scene and that this is the case for other properties in a similar position elsewhere on Kenilworth Crescent.
6. The submitted plans show that the proposed dwelling would be aligned with the front elevation of the appeal dwelling and be of a scale and massing that is not dissimilar to the neighbouring attached properties. Furthermore, I note that the appellant intends to use external materials and joinery detailing to match the existing property.
7. Nonetheless the proposed dwelling, by virtue of its position and considerable width, would project a significant distance beyond the established building line

on Kenilworth Crescent. Therefore, as a result of this significant projection, the proposed development would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene and would harm the street scene.

8. That the existing intervening service lane access between the proposed dwelling and the adjacent terrace would remain does not reduce the prominence or harm resulting from the significant projection of the proposed dwelling beyond the clearly established building line.
9. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would harm the street scene within Kenilworth Crescent contrary to Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy, Policies DMD8 and DMD37 Enfield Development Management Development Document and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, that amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development is appropriate to its location and maintains the character of the local area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR