

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

**by Les Greenwood MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 April 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3314459**

**2 Athole Gardens, Enfield EN1 2EW**

- 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 Nisha Tailor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
  - The application Ref 22/03661/HOU, dated 26 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2022.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of a detached garage and the construction of a double storey side, part front and part rear extension, with associated balcony and front bay window, alterations to the front entrance door and side facing window fenestrations.
- 

## 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 house and Athole Gardens.

## Reasons

3. Athole Gardens is a short suburban cul-de-sac lined by detached and semi-detached houses of similar style, with double height bay window projections at the front and hipped or crown roofs. No 2 is a detached house on a wide plot, with single storey garages to either side. The proposal is to build a 2 storey extension to one side, replacing a garage, with a matching full height bay at the front and also stretching well to the rear. A new first floor element would also be added to the other side of the house, at the back.
4. I note that a potential revised design was discussed with the Council, but understand that those plans were never submitted formally. I base this decision on the plans refused by the Council.
5. Extending both forward and to the rear of the main house would create extremely long and somewhat monolithic 2 storey walls on both sides. The massing of these walls would be accentuated by a general lack of articulation or modulation of the form. Although the houses at Athole Gardens are typically deep in plan the proposal would be out of scale and proportion, even in this

context. The side walls would be overly imposing features in views from the street, particularly when entering the cul-de-sac.

6. On a more positive note, the main extension would be kept back about a metre from the side boundary, in line with the Council's Development Management Document (DMD) policy DMD14. A substantial gap would remain between the 2 storey sections of No. 2 and the houses to either side, so that there would still be space for views, air and light between the houses. The bay extension would balance the frontage of the building and could potentially blend in acceptably if carefully matched in terms of detailing and materials. Nevertheless, the bulky and awkward 2 storey side walls that would be created by this proposal would be out of character with and harmful to the street scene.
7. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the house and Athole Gardens. It therefore conflicts with the shared aims of London Plan policies D4 and D8, Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 policy CP30 and DMD policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37, to secure high quality development that is appropriate in terms of scale, bulk and massing.
8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Les Greenwood*

INSPECTOR