



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/23/3333179

39 Park Road, Enfield EN3 6SP

- 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 Dogan Altunatmaz against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02814/HOU, dated 24 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The front porch has already been constructed. The property has a similar character to many of the semi-detached and terraced houses that make up this part of the road. Ground floor bay windows and distinctive door surrounds are characteristic features of the area and make a positive contribution to the design of these houses and the quality of this street. The appeal property also includes a first floor bay window which is uncharacteristic. The attached neighbour does not include a ground floor bay but it does include an ornate door surround. The shared access doorway between the properties also has such a surround although it is less ornate, reflecting its status.
 4. The porch extends well forward of the frontage of the bay windows. It is therefore extremely prominent. It is of a form that does not reflect the design characteristics of these properties. Although I understand that the previous porch was of a similar form, it was not as deep and would not therefore have been so prominent. In any event, the new porch is at odds with the character and appearance of this property and the wider street. It detracts from the character and appearance of the area and it represents poor design in this context.
 5. Given the above, the design and scale of the porch results in conflict with the design aspirations of policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010); DMD8 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document
-

(2014); and Policy D4 of The London Plan (2021). The *National Planning Policy Framework 2023* is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.

6. Reference is made to permitted development rights but it is accepted that the proposal exceeds the ground area limitation. It is suggested that there is a fallback position whereby, if the width were reduced to 80cm, it would fall within permitted development limitations but would still have a similar wider impact given that its depth would be retained. This does not appear to be a realistic fallback position or one that is likely to be implemented. However, even if this were likely to be a realistic prospect, it would not, as a material consideration, outweigh my concerns.
7. The appellant contends that the immediate area contains a mixed palette of architectural styles and designs that are not consistent but which add to the overall character. Reference is also made to the porch at 3 Park Road. Whilst it is accepted that there is a variety of styles and structures in addition to the generally more consistent form of the properties on this side of the road and to the east, this proposal does not positively add to the overall mix and detracts from it.
8. In conclusion, as there are no matters that outweigh my concerns, I dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR