
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/21/3281549

25 Amersham Avenue, Edmonton, London N18 1DT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Androulla Ioannou against the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/02284/FUL, is dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of two bedroom four person house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal is against the Council's failure to determine the planning application within the relevant statutory timeframe. The Council's statement indicates that they would have refused planning permission for the proposed development, for reasons relating to the character and appearance of the area and highway and pedestrian safety. The appellant has had the opportunity to respond to this in their final comments.
3. I have taken the description of development from the application form. Although different to the decision notice, no confirmation that a change was agreed has been provided.
4. At the time of my visit, there was a parking area to the front of the host property. As this does not reflect the submitted plans, I have considered the appeal as a proposed scheme and on the basis of the submitted drawings.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and
 - highway and pedestrian safety with regard to parking provision and sight lines.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The site lies in an established residential area characterised by two-storey terraced and semi-detached housing of traditional design incorporating hipped roofs and bay windows. Houses in the area are generally set back from the road with front gardens. In many cases, these gardens have been removed and replaced with parking spaces. On corner plots, there is wider spacing than other properties some of which have built garages on. This does not, however, alter the character of the area which is open with uninterrupted views at most spacious corner plots.
7. The appeal site is spacious enough to accommodate a dwelling as evidenced by the infill development opposite which sits on a similarly sized plot. Clearly, whilst the proposal would increase the density of development within the area, the proposed dwelling would not result in a cramped form of development. The infill development opposite has successfully integrated into its setting in terms of layout. I have no reason to believe that this would not be the same for a dwelling on this plot.
8. The design approach of the proposed dwelling does not draw on the architectural style of prevailing dwellings which generally have hipped roofs with matching build lines. Its proposed gable roof would jar with the existing hipped roofs in the area and its design would neither replicate those in the surrounding area or be viewed as a contemporary addition to the area. As a result of its height, mass and form sitting forward of the existing terraces on the row, the introduction of the dwelling would appear as an incongruous addition within the streetscene. Thereby harming the character and appearance of the area.
9. The infill development opposite is contemporary in design, formed by single-storey and two-storey elements with a flat roof set below existing roof lines. This results in the development being subordinate within the streetscene as it is set at a lower height and its massing is reduced as its upper level is recessed back. It is also seen against the side extension of the adjacent house and when viewed together they do not interrupt the uniformity of the street. The extension at No 27 is attached to the corner property rather than being separate as the appeal scheme would be. In this regard, existing developments are materially different to the appeal proposal.
10. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is contrary to Policies GG2, D3, D4 and H2 of the London Plan (2021), DMD 6, DMD 7, DMD 37 and DMD 38 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document (DMD), as well as CP4 and CP30 of The Enfield Plan the Core Strategy (Core Strategy) These seek, amongst other things, high-quality design and to protect and enhance the character of the locality. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which sets out that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Parking provision and Highway Safety

11. No parking survey has been provided. Nonetheless, at the time of my site visit, mid-morning on a Tuesday and which I appreciate is only a snapshot in time, there were a small number of vehicles parked on the roads surrounding the site. Signage advising permits was also in place. Nevertheless, there were several areas where on street parking spaces were available. Additionally, many of the driveway spaces were vacant.

12. Off street parking is provided for the proposed dwelling. Given the availability of spaces nearby, and the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary there would be sufficient on street space to accommodate the displaced parking. Therefore, there would be no highway safety concerns with regards to parking provisions.
13. The proposal would provide an off-street parking space. Were the appeal to be allowed, conditions could be imposed regarding bin and cycle stores to ensure they did not obscure sight lines at the access and pedestrian access to the property could be provided. Visibility splays would be similar to that of the other properties on this section of the road and the scheme would utilise an existing access. Pedestrians would be able to clearly see vehicles entering or exiting the site and vehicles emerging from the frequent accesses would not be unexpected. Vehicle speeds would be low given the site constraints and vehicles using the drive would have visibility to see nearby road users and pedestrians as boundary treatments are low along the street.
14. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm highway and pedestrian safety with regard to parking provision and sight lines. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021), DMD 8, DMD 45, DMD 46 and DMD 47 of the DMD, CP24 and CP25 of the Core Strategy (2010) and the Framework. Which, amongst other matters, relate to parking infrastructure and highway and pedestrian safety.

Other Matters

15. I have had regard to the appellant's statement of case including lack of communication from Council Officers. Whilst frustration on these matters would be understandable, they do not alter my findings with regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the area.
16. The proposal, although small, would make a contribution to the Council's housing target. Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

17. The proposal would provide adequate provision for off-road parking and be acceptable in terms of highway safety. However, this matter would not outweigh the harm I have identified with regard to the effects on the character and appearance of the area.
18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
19. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR