



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/21/3287919

19 Abbey Road, Enfield EN1 2QP

- 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 G McGill against the decision of London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/03277/HOU, dated 25 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension, garage conversion and alterations to remaining garage roof.
-

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 Bush Hill Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The 'Bush Hill Park Conservation Area Enfield Character Appraisal' (2006) (CACA) recognises Abbey Road as siting within the core area of the CA. The significance of the CA lies in the formal layout of the mainly large detached and semi-detached dwellings, which are occasionally interspersed with blocks of flats, and the mainly high quality of design, materials and detailing of the CA's built form.
4. Abbey Road is tree lined and the dwellings there are mostly set back from front boundaries giving a spacious feel to the road. The design of dwellings varies but more often they incorporate high quality traditional architecture. Semi-detached pairs of dwellings on the road generally have a high degree of symmetry including in terms of their general massing. The appeal dwelling sits within a wider plot than the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 17 Abbey Road and has single storey attached garage buildings. Even so, the dwellings themselves are of a similar width and have matching roof forms, two-storey front bay projections, arched porch surrounds and similar facing materials. The shared characteristics of this pair of semi-detached dwellings adds to the order and high quality built form of the street scene and positively contributes¹ to the significance of the CA.
5. The roof of the first-floor side extension would not be set down from the main roof of the host dwelling and the front elevation would only be marginally set back. In combination with the matching materials proposed, the massing of the

¹ As recognised on 'Map 3: townscape analysis' of the CACA

first-floor side extension would not be highly distinguishable from the original form of the dwelling in views from the street. It would elongate the width of the dwelling and give it a much bulkier appearance than the adjoining dwelling at No 17 Abbey Road. This would detract from the architectural cohesion and symmetry between the respective pair of semi-detached dwellings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the CA.

6. My attention has been drawn to side extensions at Nos 21 and 36 Abbey Road. I saw on my site visit that in contrast to the appeal proposal, the design of the roof over those extensions incorporates a set back from the principal roof slope. In any case, these examples do not persuade me that the appeal proposal would positively respond to the form of the host dwelling, the matching semi-detached pair it relates to, or the wider street scene of the CA.
7. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Paragraph 200 of the Framework states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
8. Taking all the above factors into account, I find that the development would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the CA. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
9. The appellant contends that the proposal would improve the accommodation in the dwelling including in terms of its insulation and security. However, these would be private benefits. The existing timber fronted garage, whilst not a positive aspect of the street scene, has a relatively understated presence due to its modest scale. Consequently, the proposed alterations to this garage would not result in any tangible benefits for the CA sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.
10. I conclude the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the Bush Hill Park CA. In that regard, the proposal would conflict with the design, context and conservation requirements of Policies D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach), D4 (Delivering good design) and HC1 (Heritage conservation and growth) of the London Plan 2021, Core Policies 30 (Maintaining and Improving the Quality of the Built and Open Environment) and 31 (Built and Landscape Heritage) of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010) and Policies DMD 14 (Side Extensions), DMD 37 (Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development) and DMD 44 (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets) of the Enfield Council Development Management Document (2014).

Conclusion

11. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA and therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR