



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3371139
124 Aldermans Hill, London 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 Ranie Datoo against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01904/HOU.
 - The proposed development is for a side extension to both sides of the front entrance porch - containing security accommodation/storage.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a quite imposing two and a half storey detached villa at the junction of Aldermans Hill and Ulleswater Road opposite Broomfield Park.
4. The principal elevation is symmetrical in its appearance with a clear hierarchy in terms of its fenestration. There exists a reasonable spacing between the top of the existing ground floor windows and the cills of the first floor windows above. The proposal would see the former removed to make way for a parapet flat roof extension to each side of the central projecting gable which would accentuate the void between the windows at ground and first floor level.
5. I consider that the proposal before me is an improvement on the previous two schemes that were dismissed on appeal by my colleagues, however the proposed front elevation would be a retrograde step from the original design of the existing dwelling and bearing in mind the location adjacent to a conservation area, attention to detail in a historically sensitive setting is critical. I acknowledge that the proposed extensions would not add significant bulk to the front of the property although I cannot agree that they would harmonise seamlessly with it notwithstanding their modest proportions.
6. Further, and with respect, I consider that the position of the new front windows cannot be described as only being slightly lower than the ones to be replaced. It has been stipulated that if considered necessary for approval, taller windows could

be installed within the front elevation of the extensions to lessen the gap between those on the ground and first floors, however I consider that it would not be appropriate to secure via a condition in the absence of any drawings identifying how such alteration to the size of the windows could be facilitated, I remain to be convinced on this.

7. I acknowledge that the scheme in part intends to provide accommodation for security personnel, however I noted on my site visit that the site is surrounded by high metal railings with artificial green screening behind, and with cameras located all around the perimeter of the property. Further, whilst having regard to the crime statistics that have been cited, the majority of other dwellings within the locality have open frontages as opposed to the more fortress like appearance of the appeal site and whilst I am most certainly not in a position to belittle the appellant's concerns, and accept that the park can encourage anti-social behaviour on occasions, I consider in the overall planning balance, that such matters do not override the harm that the proposal would have upon the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal, in particular through the loss of the existing ground floor fenestration on the principal elevation as a result of the 2no single storey extensions, would derail the existing architectural composition of the host dwelling as it would overaccentuate the window to void ratios which would render it incongruous in appearance and harmful to the Aldermans Hill street scene and the setting of the conservation area. Consequently I consider that the proposal conflicts with policy D4 of The London Plan (2021), policy CP30 Core Strategy 2010-2025 (November 2010) and DMD37 of The Improving Enfield Development Management Document (November 2014) which together require all developments to be high quality and that development that is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings will be refused whilst stipulating that development should capitalise on the opportunities available for improving an area.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR