
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/20/3248856

1A Eversley Crescent, Southgate N21 1EL

- 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 and Mrs Arricale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/02649/FUL, dated 23 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the sub-division of site and erection of a new 2-bedroom family dwelling and proposed crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council's second reason for refusal referred to the impact of the proposal on the outlook from 1 Eversley Crescent. However the neighbouring dwelling closest to the development is No.1a and it is considered that reference to No.1 was in error. As such it is the impact on the occupiers of No.1a that has been assessed in this decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 1a Eversley Crescent in relation to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is occupied by a part two-storey, part single storey dwelling with a garden to the rear and to the side. The surrounding area is residential in nature and largely comprised of moderately sized detached dwellings. The

garden to the side of the dwelling fronts Eversley Crescent and is partially separated from the existing dwelling (No.1A) by a brick wall. The proposed development is a chalet-style bungalow located on the garden area to the side of the existing property, and includes an area to the front for car parking and a new crossover onto Eversley Crescent.

6. The proposed dwelling would front the main road and therefore would be highly visible within the public realm. Although visibility alone is not a reason for refusal, it does mean it would have an impact upon the character and appearance of the area. This would be exacerbated by the loss of the open and green nature of the site which has a positive impact upon the area. The dwelling is smaller than those surrounding it, however this would not make it any less visible in the streetscene. The proposal would largely follow the curved building line, but would sit forward of others along this road. Its proximity to the road and the siting of the dwelling at a higher ground level than other dwellings on Eversley Crescent, would make the proposed dwelling a dominant and intrusive addition to the streetscene.
7. Although it would meet the Council's requirements for garden and parking space, the properties in the surrounding area have much larger front and rear amenity spaces and are relatively spacious in nature. Due to the restrictive nature of the site, the space surrounding the dwelling would be much smaller and the dwelling would appear much more cramped than the surrounding properties. The neighbouring properties are made up of a variety of sizes and designs, however they are generally on relatively large plots and are moderately large dwellings. The small size of the plot and of the dwelling, would appear out of keeping with those surrounding it and would not match the prevailing pattern of development, resulting in a visually incongruous appearance to the detriment to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Although not explicitly within the reasons for refusal, the Council has raised concerns regarding the amount of hardstanding to the front of the proposed dwelling and the lack of landscaping. It is acknowledged that the loss of current green space and planting on the site would have a negative impact upon the appearance of the area, giving it a harder urban appearance. However, the proposed level of hardstanding would be in keeping with the surrounding properties where large paved driveways are commonplace.
9. Overall, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be contrary to the relevant sections of Policies 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD6, DMD7, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (2014). These policies collectively seek to ensure new development does not harm but reinforces or enhances the character of the area, has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces, has a high quality of design and is appropriately located. The proposed development would also be contrary to the general design principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living Conditions

10. 1A Eversley Crescent would share a boundary with the proposed dwelling. Although not mentioned within the reason for refusal, the Council's report makes reference to Policy DMD11 which states that first floor additions must not exceed a line taken at 30-degrees from the mid-point of the nearest

original first floor window to any of the adjacent properties. Even though the proposal is not a first-floor addition, it does have a first-floor aspect which the Council indicate would breach a 30-degree line from the first-floor window on the front elevation of No.1A. However, despite the prevailing gradient, due to the chalet style nature and reduced height of the proposal compared to the two-storey element of No.1A, the proposal would not result in a loss of outlook for the occupiers of this dwelling,. Also, due to the orientation of the proposed dwelling there would not be a significant loss of light.

11. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupier of 1A Eversley Crescent and would not be contrary to the relevant sections of Policies DMD7 and DMD8. The relevant sections of these policies ensure that new residential development does not adversely impact residential amenity in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and overlooking. It is noted that Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) was also included in the second reason for refusal, however this is not directly relevant to the impact upon living conditions.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has stated that the current Local Plan is out of date and therefore a presumption in favour of sustainable development must be applied. It has not been specified as to why it is considered out of date, however I consider the policies relevant to the proposal are generally consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore, they can be given full weight in the assessment of the proposal.
13. It is noted that the proposed development would provide one additional dwelling which could be used as a starter home, would make effective use of the land which is largely unused by the current owners, would boost the local economy through employment and the payment of Council Tax and would be subject to the payment of a CIL contribution. However, these benefits are minimal as they relate to just one additional dwelling and so would not be significant enough to outweigh the substantial harm found to the character and appearance of the area. It is also noted that the proposal would exceed the Council's internal and external space requirements for new housing, however this could only be given neutral weight and therefore would also not outweigh the harm found.

Conclusions and Recommendation

14. Although the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling, harm has been found to the character and appearance of the area which would not be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR