



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/21/3279938

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 & Mrs Arricale against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/00596/FUL, dated 9 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "sub-division of site erection of a new build 3 bedroom family dwelling and proposed crossover."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Both parties have referred to an earlier proposal for a house on this site that was dismissed on appeal. I have had regard to that decision but have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is part of the garden to 1A Eversley Crescent and lies to the rear of houses on Wades Hill. The surrounding area is residential in character, typically comprising two-storey detached houses in the immediate vicinity of the site, although the host dwelling is a mix of single and two-storey elements. The surrounding houses typically occupy much of the width of their plots with limited space to either side, but generally have generous front gardens and deep rear gardens. While 1A has a relatively shallow rear garden, it is set well off the rear boundary of its plot. While the proposed house would have a smaller footprint than neighbouring properties, it would nevertheless be much closer to its rear boundary due to the plot being substantially shallower than that of any neighbouring property. Although this would not be readily apparent in the street scene, from neighbouring properties the proposed development would appear uncharacteristically cramped in relation to the surrounding properties.
5. The proposed house would be narrower than those in the immediate vicinity. It would be set back from the street in line with the neighbouring houses on Wades Hill and Eversley Crescent, and its ridgeline would be lower than that of

1A despite the existing house being at a lower level in the street. Given the varied roofline of houses in the street scene due to the differences in site levels and the size and profile of individual houses, the proposed house would not appear overly dominant or obtrusive in the Eversley Crescent street scene.

6. Nevertheless, due to the relatively shallow plot, the appeal proposal would appear cramped and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 and Policies DMD 6, DMD 7, DMD 8 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014. Collectively these policies require that development positively respond to local distinctiveness and that the individual plot size, scale and form of development are appropriate to the existing pattern of development or setting.

Planning Balance

7. The appellants have referred to the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). As the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, this would only be engaged where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date. However, the appellants have not provided evidence to show that either of these is the case. I am satisfied that the policies identified above, which are the most important policies for determining this application, are consistent with the Framework. There is also no argument before me that the Council has a shortfall in its supply of deliverable housing land, or that the Council's delivery of housing was substantially below its housing requirement over the previous three years. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is therefore not engaged in this instance.
8. The appeal proposal would create one new family house providing accommodation in line with the Council's standards. This would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. While there is no indication that the Council has a shortfall in its housing delivery or housing land supply, this does not diminish the value of new housing.
9. Set against this would be the harm to the character and appearance of the area from the scale of development on this relatively small site. The benefits arising from a single dwelling are limited, and in this case those benefits would be outweighed by the harm that would result from the appeal proposal. There are therefore no material considerations to indicate that this appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR