



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3362025

174 Elsing Road, Enfield EN1 4NZ

- 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 Mr Orhan Toraman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/03036/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2-storey side and rear extensions and the conversion of a house into 2 dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the application form is vague and the one used by the Council is potentially misleading. To avoid possible confusion I have used an amended description in the banner heading above.
3. The side and rear additions for which planning permission has been sought are already in place. However, the property is currently laid out as 3 flats and the dormer has been extended, which does not form part of the proposal before me.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area,
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 172 and 176 Elsing Road, with particular regard to outlook and natural light, and
 - iii) the supply of family housing in the borough.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with a rear dormer. Prior to its extension it was a 3-bedroom dwelling. It is situated in a residential estate comprising a mix of semi-detached and terraced houses of similar age and appearance. The frontages of these properties display a high degree of uniformity, particularly in areas where front lawns have been retained. However, many

- properties, including the appeal property's attached pair, include single storey rear additions, and a small number, including the appeal property, have rear dormers.
6. The appeal property has an extensive recent planning history including a dismissed appeal in April 2024¹. This followed the refusal of retrospective planning permission for the conversion of the property into 3 self-contained flats and erection of a two storey side extension, a part single, part 2 storey rear extension, an extension to the rear dormer and the installation of rooflights in the front roof slope. The appeal scheme before me would create 2 dwellings as opposed to 3 and excludes the dormer addition. It would however be the same as the 2024 scheme in respect of the side and rear additions and therefore I attribute significant weight to the observations made by my colleague in respect of the April 2024 appeal.
 7. The 2-storey side extension aligns with the front elevation and front roof slope of the appeal property, effectively extending the original profile of the appeal property further to the side. This reduces the gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring end of terrace house. However, given the preponderance of terraces in the area the reduced width of the gap and the widening of the semi-detached pair of houses results in a form of development that is broadly compatible with its surroundings when viewed from the street.
 8. In considering the rear addition in 2014 my colleague noted that the rear of the property is visible from parts of Elsing Road and the flat roof design of the extension is uncharacteristic of the area, incongruous, and in a highly prominent position. I entirely concur with these observations and find no reason to take a contrary view. Due to its siting, size, bulk and appearance this element of the proposal is an overly prominent, disproportionate and incongruous addition that has an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
 9. For these reasons, the proposal is contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP), Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) (CS), and Policies DMD8, DMD11, DMD13, DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (DMD). Amongst other matters these policies seek development that positively responds to local distinctiveness, is of a high quality, appropriate scale, bulk and massing, and avoids adverse visual impacts.

Living Conditions

10. My colleague carried out a detailed assessment of the effects of the rear and side additions on natural light to, and outlook from, the neighbouring houses to either side of the appeal property. It was concluded that there was no harm in respect of daylight and sunlight to these properties and sufficient outlook would be retained at the rear of 176 Elsing Road and from the ground floor windows serving No. 172. Based on my observations on site and the information before me I concur with these views.
11. In respect of outlook from the first floor window at the rear of No. 172 my colleague noted that even though the first floor element of the rear extension is slightly set in from the shared boundary between the appeal property and No. 172, the extension would appear prominent and overbearing from this window. The appellant's submission on this issue is noted but it does not convince me to take a contrary

¹ APP/Q5300/W/23/333076

view to my colleague given the relationship between the proposal and the neighbouring window appears to be precisely the same as previously proposed.

12. In conclusion, due to its siting, height and rear protrusion beyond the main elevation of No. 172 the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 172. As such it fails to accord with DMD Policies DMD8, DMD10 and DMD37, CS Policies CP4 and CP30 and LP Policies D3 and D8. Amongst other matters these policies seek to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties and promote inclusive and sustainable neighbourhoods. There is also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016). Council's decision notice also refers to Policy D8 of the LP. This relates to the public realm and is not therefore applicable to this issue.

Family Housing

13. The proposal would result in the loss of a 3-bedroom house with a study and the formation of a self-contained 3-bedroom flat on the ground floor with direct access to a rear garden, and a 5-bedroom unit in the upper floors with access to a private garden at the rear via the alleyway to the side of the property.
14. Policy DMD5 of the DMD requires compensatory provision for family accommodation of 3 or more bedrooms to be provided where a development involves the conversion of existing units into self-contained flats. The pair of proposed dwellings would provide appropriately sized accommodation for families and would therefore adequately compensate for the loss of a family house. Accordingly, I find no harm in respect of the proposal's effects on the supply of family housing in the borough.
15. For this reason, the proposal accords with LP Policies H1 and H10, CS Policies CP4, CP5 and CP30, and DMD Policy DMD5 which, amongst other matters seek to provide an appropriate mix of housing, and to resist the loss of family housing.

Other Matters

16. The proposed floor plans indicate that the upper floor accommodation would not be fully self-contained. This would result in unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out under the first and second main issues, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR