



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2025

**by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30<sup>th</sup> January 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3348501**

**47 Lansbury Road, Enfield, EN3 5NN**

- 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 Suleyman Tekagac against the decision of Enfield Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01741/HOU.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a part single-, part 2-storey rear extension; a hip to gable loft conversion including a rear dormer and front rooflights; and a front entrance porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development above is taken from both the application form and the Council's decision notice to reflect the full nature of the proposal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area around Lansbury Road.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-terraced house, situated on the southern side of Lansbury Road, close to its junction with Ian Square. In common with the house at the opposite end of the terrace (No 53), it is a double-fronted house with a central front door and a hipped roof. The two central houses in the terrace are narrower in width and the whole terrace has a degree of symmetry, although the appeal property has only one two-storey front bay, whereas No 53 has a bay on each side of the front door.
5. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two-storey rear extension with a flat roof across part of the rear elevation. It would also include a hip-to-gable roof extension with a large rear dormer in the rear roof slope. The proposal also includes the construction of a single-storey rear extension and a front porch. The Council indicates that it does not consider the single-storey extension or the porch would be harmful to the appearance of the immediate surroundings, and I concur with that view. On that basis the key matter to be considered is the impact of the two-storey rear extension and the alterations to the roof.

6. There is a significant gap between No 47 and the adjacent property at No 19A Ian Square, such that the side elevation of the appeal property is highly visible and prominent in the street scene when approaching from the west. The general character and appearance of the area along this part of Lansbury Road is one of short terraces and semi-detached houses of very similar design, all with hipped roofs. Nos 48 – 54, which are directly opposite to the appeal property, form a terrace with almost identical features and symmetry to that of the terrace that includes No 47, including double-fronted houses at each end with hipped roofs.
7. The proposed development at the appeal property would result in a long, largely blank side elevation with a two-storey, flat-roofed extension at the rear, together with a gable end and the side of a flat-roofed dormer in the rear roof slope. This would be in marked contrast to the prevailing character and appearance of other houses along the road and at the eastern end of Ian Square, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the immediate surroundings.
8. The appellant contends that the proposed development would be similar to that at No 53 at the other end of the terrace. However, from my site visit, it would appear that No 53 has a two-storey rear extension with a hipped roof form that complements the existing roof in the design and pitch of the hip. The proposal at No 47 would not complement the existing roof design and would appear incongruous with regard to the host property and the street scene, and unbalanced in the context of the terrace and the surrounding area.
9. The appellant also contends that the hip-to-gable element of the proposal could be permitted development in the context of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the General Permitted Development Order. However, there is no Certificate of Lawful Development available, and I do not have sufficient information to determine whether this might or might not be the case. In the context of the overall proposal, I consider that the combination of the flat-roofed rear extension with the hip-to-gable alteration and rear dormer above would be harmful to the appearance of the area.
10. Core Policy 30 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) states that all developments must be high quality and design-led, having special regard to their context. Policy DMD13 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD) states that roof extensions to the side of a property must not disrupt the character or balance of the property or group of properties of which the dwelling forms a part, and should not be dominant when viewed from the surrounding area. Policy DMD37 indicates that development that is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings, will be refused.
11. In conclusion, and in the light of the above, I find that the proposed rear extension and the construction of the hip-to-gable alteration with the large rear dormer would be harmful to the otherwise largely consistent character and appearance of the area around Lansbury Road. It would, on this basis, conflict with Core Policy 30 of the CS and Policies DMD 13 and 37 of the DMD. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

*J D Westbrook*

INSPECTOR