



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3364748

96 Natal Road, Southgate, Enfield, N11 2HY

- 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 Athena Alexiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/04137/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling dating from the early 1900s and occupying a corner location with a side return to the A406, North Circular Road. Natal Road is entirely residential in character comprising similar aged and styled properties. The A406 is a multi-laned, heavily trafficked route lined with a mix of residences, ground floor shopping parades, and other commercial premises. The proposal is for a single-storey extension to the side of the appeal premises and which would wrap around part of its rear elevation, up to and abutting its two-storey outrigger, and projecting beyond the dwelling's main rear elevation by over 10m.
4. Section 4.5 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD), adopted in 2014, addresses residential extensions. DMD Policy DMD11 deals specifically with residential rear extensions. Amongst other things it requires there to be no adverse visual impact and for an extension not to exceed 3m in depth beyond the original rear wall in the case of terraced and semi-detached properties. DMD Policy DMD14 deals with side extensions. It states, amongst other things, that on return frontages, a distance must be maintained from the back edge of the pavement to the flank wall and that this will be assessed having regard to a number of criteria, including the need to maintain a relationship with any established building line, the character of the area, and the bulk/dominance of the structure and its degree of subordination in relation to the host dwelling.

5. The appellant correctly points out the eclectic pattern of development immediately surrounding the appeal property. However, despite the prominent corner position of No 96, its orientation, scale, proportions, and detailing define its purpose and place as part of the distinct character of the residential enclave along Natal Road and which is obviously set apart from the busy A406.
6. The extension would be openly seen from the public domain along North Circular Road as a large and deep addition to an existing dwelling, and one that would subsume the ground floor side and rear elevations of the property. It would reach up to cill height of the first-floor windows and would shroud the lower half of a two-storey feature side bay, removing a large and important part of the visual appeal presented by the building to its side return. The extension's excessive depth and horizontally proportioned form would also appear significantly at odds with the size and proportions of the original building, together with a large and unrelieved mass of brickwork set close to the plot's side boundary that would be seen above the boundary fence along the adjoining pavement, and in views approaching from further afield, as dominant and visually overbearing.
7. In addition, the extension would intrude into a loosely defined forward building line that runs between buildings extending each side of Natal Road along this side of North Circular Road, and which helps to create a degree of space and openness within the otherwise overwhelmingly busy nature of this major traffic route. Its encroachment here would contribute further to an extension overall that would appear poorly sited, overly large, and unsympathetic, with little consideration shown for the context of its surroundings or the architectural composition of the existing dwelling.
8. By reason of its position, scale, depth and overall visual impact, there would be clear conflict with the specific requirements of DMD Policies DMD11 and DMD14. By appearing inappropriate within its context with insufficient regard to its surroundings there would also be conflict with DMD Policies DMD8 and DMD37, and Core Policy 30 of the Council's Core Strategy, adopted in 2010, as far as they all require a high-quality standard of design for new development, including residential. For the same reasons there would be conflict with The London Plan Policy D4 as far as it requires the delivery of good design, and the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR