
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by John Gunn DipTP, DipDBE, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/22/3298966

Land adjacent to 58 Addison Avenue, London N14 4AH

- 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 Mrs Norah Gallagher against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 22/00533/FUL, dated 15 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of two-bedroom bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposal on trees and biodiversity.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is to the rear of 58 Addison Avenue, a corner property, and has a frontage onto Masefield Crescent. It abuts an electricity sub-station on its southern boundary and is screened from the highway by a prefabricated concrete wall situated at the back edge of the pavement. A number of trees are located on, or directly adjacent the appeal site.
4. The appeal site is located within an established residential area characterised by primarily two storey terraced dwellings with long narrow rear gardens. The properties in Addison Avenue and The Fairway, contribute towards a definitive layout for this part of the estate, with the dwellings being arranged in parallel rows, and with significant distances between them. The intervening space contains a limited number of single storey outbuildings and landscape features, but for the most part the area has a feeling of spaciousness.
5. However, the proposal would result in the introduction of a dwelling on a plot smaller than the majority of the dwellings in the immediate locality, and there would be a corresponding impact on the grain of the development found locally. Consequently, it would appear cramped on the plot and be out of

keeping with the more generous spatial qualities found in other properties in the area.

6. Whilst the proposed development would not be in an isolated location it would, due to its scale and mass, be clearly visible over the fences and walls that enclose rear gardens. As a result, it would introduce a building that would appear incongruous and prominent, at odds with the relatively unfettered gardens of the neighbouring properties. This would erode the spacious qualities currently found in the area.
7. I have taken into account the development at 52 Masefield Crescent¹. Whilst noting some similarities with the appeal proposal I do not have full details of the earlier scheme and I am not aware of the circumstances that prevailed at the time permission was granted. As a result, I cannot conclude that the schemes are directly comparable. In any event all decisions should be made on their own individual merits.
8. I conclude, on this main issue, that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies GG2, D3, D4 and H2 of the London Plan (2021), DMD 6, DMD7, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Improving Enfield - Development Management Document (2014), CP2, CP4 and CP30 of The Enfield Plan – Core Strategy (2010) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies, amongst other matters, seek high quality developments that respond positively to the existing character of the area within which they would be located.

Trees and biodiversity

9. I saw on my site visit that there are a number of deciduous and coniferous trees located on the appeal site and further trees are proposed. I noted that the trees would be located very close to the proposed bungalow. As a result, it is likely that their roots and canopies would come into conflict with the proposed development, to such an extent that the prospect of their future survival would be brought into question.
10. Accordingly, while the appellant has submitted a tree protection plan, from the limited evidence before me, and in the absence of a detailed arboricultural survey, I am not persuaded that the proposal would ensure the longevity of the existing and proposed trees on the appeal site.
11. I conclude, on this main issue, that the proposal would harm trees and biodiversity. This is contrary to Policies G6 and G7 of the London Plan (2021), Policy DMD 80 of the Improving Enfield - Development Management Document (2014), Policy CP36 of The Enfield Plan – Core Strategy (2010) and the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other matters, to retain and protect trees of amenity and biodiversity value.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Gunn

INSPECTOR

¹ P13/1907/PLA