



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/24/3355684

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 Dattoo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/03010/HOU.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension to front entrance porch and installation of 2 windows to side elevation at ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.
3. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and host property.

Reasons

5. The site is located within a predominantly residential area, the appeal property is a prominent detached house located on the corner of Ullswater Road and Aldermans Hill, opposite Broomfield Park. The area comprises various residential properties forms.
6. The appeal site is adjacent the Lakes Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.

7. The front of the appeal property has a symmetry in terms of windows and features with a centre gabled projection. The proposed development would remove existing ground floor windows on one side of the fascia. The single storey extension would infill an area to the side of the central porch and the side of the property and would include windows proportionate to the existing windows in the appeal property, however at a lower level.
8. Whilst the proposed development would be screened to a degree by vegetation and the boundary treatment at the appeal site, I observed during my site visit that views of the fascia are obvious in the streetscene. There is an existing outbuilding to the front of the site, despite its presence views of the front of the property where the proposed development would be located are still evidence.
9. I understand that a similar proposal was previous dismissed appeal¹, however the proposed before me has been revised in an attempt to address the previous refusal. Notwithstanding the revisions, the proposed extension and removal of the windows would unbalance the features of the existing property.
10. The proposed development would be an incongruous addition to the property, failing to respect the buildings proportions.
11. The appellant considers that alterations to the existing ground floor windows would not constitute development. The proposed development before me includes the removal of the windows as such I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal. Notwithstanding this I find that the proposed extension is unsympathetic to the form of the existing property.
12. The Council do not raise concerns with regard to the insertion of the side windows in the existing property, I do not disagree.
13. Nevertheless, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and host property.
14. There is conflict with Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010); Policies DMD8 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) and Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) which seek amongst other things to ensure developments are appropriate to their context, taking into account the surrounding area.
15. There is also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Q5300/D/23/3324558