



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3324558

Aldermans House, 124 Aldermans Hill, Southgate, Enfield N13 4PT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Ranie Datoos against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 23/00648/HOU, dated 1 March 2023 was refused by notice dated 26 April 2023.
 - The development is proposed side extension to front porch – containing security accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2023. This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issues, and I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a substantial two storey detached dwelling prominently situated on Aldermans Hill at the junction of Ulleswater Road and opposite Broomfield Park, a large expanse of open space including sport and play facilities. This part of Aldermans Hill is characterised by residential development made up of a combination of substantial period residential properties set back from the highway by short front gardens and driveways and open frontages, and modern apartment blocks set in domestic scale grounds.
5. The proposal involves an extension at ground floor on the front elevation of the appeal property facing Aldermans Hill. It would fill the gap between the centrally located front entrance porch and the side elevation closest to 125 Aldermans Hill and is intended to provide a security booth and WC.
6. When viewed from the front the proposed extension would appear to cut across the existing windows in the front elevation, with the uppermost panes remaining visible above the flat roof of the extension. Moreover, the window in the front elevation of the proposal would be offset from the window behind and would have a horizontal emphasis not reflecting the proportions of the windows

in the porch adjacent and at odds with the vertically proportioned windows in the remainder of the front elevation of the dwelling. The expanse of rendered façade would contribute the proposal's awkward and poorly proportioned appearance.

7. Despite the extension being set back from the road frontage and partially screened by vegetation to some extent, it would still be visible when viewed from Aldermans Hill appearing incongruous and out of keeping with the host property, thus harmful to its character and appearance and the street scene in general, where the front elevations of properties are largely unaltered. In any event, lack of public visibility does not obviate the need to achieve good design.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies DMD6, DMD8 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document 2014 which, amongst other things seeks to ensure that development is appropriate to its context having regard for its surroundings. There would also be conflict with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy 2010 which promotes high quality design. The Council refer to London Plan Policy D4 in relation to this main issue, but as this relates to masterplans and design scrutiny appropriate to larger development schemes it has not been a determinative factor in coming to my decision on this main issue.

Other Matters

9. The appellant states that the development is required to maintain security for the occupants of the dwelling in an area with a very high crime rate and has submitted a map and statistics relating to crime in the area. However, the information covers a wide geographical area and encompasses a variety of environments which may be more susceptible to crime than the more precise location of the appeal property. Whilst I do not doubt that the appellants fear of crime is genuine, I am not persuaded that the information about the occurrence of crime in the area directly relates to the environment within which the appeal property is set. Furthermore, from my visit it was evident that occupiers of other residential properties in the area have not taken similar measures to protect their properties from criminal activity, and even if that were the case, I am not persuaded that this matter overrides the harm that I have identified.
10. There would be no harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, however, this is not a factor which weighs in favour of allowing the appeal and does not diminish the harm that I have found on the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR