
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3367644

1 Amersham Avenue, Edmonton N18 1DS

- 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 Stephen Villaflor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/03779/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension with integrated solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description on the application form includes additional explanatory text. For clarity and ease of identifying the development to which the appeal relates, I have based the description above on the decision notice and delegated report. This omission does not alter any fundamental aspects of the proposal, nor does it prejudice the ability of any party to present their arguments regarding the appeal scheme. I have taken the additional information into account in my findings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling occupying a prominent corner position at the junction of Amersham Avenue and Bull Lane. The site lies on the edge of a residential area adjacent a large industrial estate on Bull Lane currently undergoing redevelopment. The appeal dwelling is set back from both front and side boundaries, thus creating a pleasing sense of spaciousness at this transitional point. Landscaped areas flanking both sides of the junction enhance the visual separation between the two zones.
6. The appeal site side of Bull Lane retains a suburban character, defined by residential properties, rear gardens, domestic garages, and a section of small

workshops. This contrasts with the opposite side, which is dominated by larger industrial units. The proposed development would appear as an excessively large separate outbuilding rather than a cohesive subservient side extension, with no direct access from the host dwelling. It would extend outward to the side, abutting the pedestrian highway along Bull Lane, and would be of significant height and length that would substantially increase the built form along this boundary. This would result in a continuous, blank façade with no architectural features or visual relief. In comparison the existing boundary treatment, although in need of repair, consists of standard height garden fencing which is far less imposing for pedestrians using Bull Lane.

7. Given the site's prominence and the scale and bulk of the proposed extension, the development would appear as an incongruous and overly dominant addition. It would disrupt the established rhythm of built form along this side of Bull Lane and erode the sense of openness that characterises this residential setting.
8. As a consequence, the proposals would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus be contrary to Policies D4 and D8 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (London) (2021), Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010), and Policies DMD6, DMD8, DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of The Enfield Development Management Document (2014), which, amongst other things, seek to ensure new development is of a high quality design and be of appropriate height and bulk so as not to adversely impact on the character of the local area.

Other Matter

9. The improvement on the environmental performance of the dwelling with the proposed introduction of solar roof panels would be positive but worthy of only limited weight given it is unclear as to whether the proposed development is the only means of achieving such.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR