

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3264040

27 Broadfields Avenue, Enfield, London N21 1AB

- 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 Ms Jane Hobbs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application, Ref. 20/02728/HOU, dated 25 August 2020 was refused by notice dated 19 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part one/ part two storey wrap around extension to the rear of the property together with a rear dormer and hip to gable roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that there are four pairs of semi-detached houses of the same original design on this side of Broadfields Avenue between Paulin Drive and Cresswell Way. The pairs are handed and comprise Nos. 13 & 15; 17 & 19; 21 & 23, and 25 & 27 with shared characteristics including hipped tile roofs above white rendered walls; large rounded bay windows at both first floor and ground floor, and ground floor front projections with hipped tile roofs encompassing an integral garage and front porch.
 4. Over the years there have been modifications, most notably at the adjoining No. 25 to the appeal dwelling with large scale and dominant extensions to the rear, which the Council says are not all permitted and should not be cited as a precedent. However, for the most part it is the frontages of the dwellings with their relatively modest changes that continue to provide a pleasing rhythm and symmetry in the street scene of this part of the Avenue.
 5. As a corner site at the junction with Cresswell Way, the appeal dwelling is particularly prominent with the front, rear and a flank elevation all readily in view from the public realm. The appellant has amended an earlier similar scheme that was refused permission, but the Council considers that these changes are not significant and do not address all the design related reasons for
-

the refusal. However, it is considered that the alterations and additions would not adversely affect the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 25.

6. For the appellant it is argued that there is a fall back under various elements of permitted development ('PD') and that this has been formally confirmed with the Certificate of Lawfulness ('the CLUED') secured from the Council under application reference 20/02704/CEA. The grounds of appeal seek to demonstrate the similarity between development that on the one hand can be carried out under PD and on the other hand that now proposed under the appeal scheme.
7. However, whilst I agree that this is a consideration in favour of the proposal, I take the view that an individual analysis of each element and a comparison with PD does not give the necessarily holistic planning judgement that is available to the decision-maker under the processing of a planning application. In this case, the combination of individual elements approved within the CLUED but as now amended and supplemented by this scheme, and with the all the drawbacks in my view correctly outlined in the officer's report, would unduly compromise the original design and thereby harm the pleasing character and appearance of the house and its surroundings.
8. In particular, I refer above to the positive effect that the four semi-detached pairs have on the street scene and the fact that in its corner position No. 27 has its flank and rear exposed to public view (from the approach along Cresswell Way towards Broadfields Avenue). I consider that the cumulative effect of the variety of additions and alterations proposed would be correctly perceived as a dwelling that has been excessively enlarged and in a form unsympathetic to the original dwelling and to its surroundings. When all the additions and alterations are read together, there would be excessive bulk and dominance and an absence of coherent design.
9. I have taken account of other extensions in the locality which are argued as setting a precedent for the appeal scheme. However, I take the opposite view, in that I regard many of the developments as a reminder that further unsympathetic or over-scaled additions should be avoided to prevent more harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. In summary, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings. This would conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010; Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD13, DMD14 & DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014; Policies 7.4, 7.5 & 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 as now incorporated into the London Plan March 2021, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
11. For the reasons explained above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR