



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/25/3371364

101 Nursery Road, London N14 5QG

- 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 Ajmal Masroor against the decision of Enfield Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01921/HOU.
 - The development proposed is for an addition of a first floor rear-side extension with pitch roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end terrace house with a two storey rear extension and flat roof dormer to the rear of the main roof which are both highly visible from Avenue Road due to the site's position at its junction with Nursery Road.
4. There also exists a single storey flat roof extension to the side over which the proposal would be constructed. This would consist of a subordinate two storey gable side extension, and an extension to an existing two storey rear extension with a crown roof.
5. I have been made aware of the history of the appeal site and whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness or otherwise of the permitted designs, nonetheless a reasonably substantial two storey rear extension has already been permitted, along with a first floor extension to the flank elevation; and which I have to say is preferable to the proposal before me from an architectural standpoint.
6. Cumulatively I find that the dwelling would be over developed and bearing in mind the public exposure of the proposed rear elevation, I consider that the rear crown roof extension would be unsympathetic in design to the host dwelling and harmful to the Avenue Road street scene.
7. I have been made aware of extensions to other dwellings within the locality, however ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits and in totality I consider that the proposal, by virtue of its design, form, bulk, scale and siting would represent a dominant and obtrusive form of development that would fail to relate to,

or appear subservient to the host dwelling. Consequently I find the proposal conflicts with policy D4 of The London Plan (2021), policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core strategy 2010-2025 (November 2010) and policies DMD11, DMD14 and DMD37 of The Improving Enfield Development Management document (November 2014) which together require developments to be high quality and that development which is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings will be refused.

Conclusion

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

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR