



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by **A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3374036
207 Southbury Road Enfield EN1 1QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Perparim Hasa against the London Borough of Enfield
 - The application Ref: 25/01951/HOU.
 - The development proposed is Part single part two storey side to rear extension (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development upon:
 - the character and appearance of the area and
 - living conditions of neighbouring users.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site (No.207) is a two storey semi-detached house dating from the inter-war years in which the housing pair would originally¹ have featured a hipped, tiled, roof with canted bays on both floors and a simple recessed entrance feature. Whilst these latter features remain, a recent hip-to-gable roof conversion of No.207 has changed the visual relationship with its neighbouring property, 209 Southbury Road which is part of a block of three late Victorian or turn-of-century houses. These uniquely and distinctively interrupt the otherwise unrelieved development pattern of later terrace block housing set in sustained, parallel, building lines along both sides of Southbury Road.
4. The five houses which incorporate the appeal site, its dwelling pair together with the block of three earlier houses which run tight to the adjacent junction with Percival Road, are distinctively set at staggered angles to the main road. The flank corner of No.207 is thereby set forward of its neighbour, a characteristic which is accentuated by the added bulk of its recent roof extension.

¹ until recently in all likelihood

5. The side extension for which permission is sought, although set back from the principal front elevation is, because of the angled position, set prominently forward of No.209 and appears as an intrusive element in the street scene. The appellant refers to separation distances² these have no relevance in such circumstances and my observations indicate that even if the side extension were to be adjusted in the ways suggested by the appellant, the upper floor of the extension would continue to intrude upon an appreciation of the form and setting of the adjacent house to the significant detriment of the street scene. I consider the development conflicts with Policies DMD6, DMD14 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (EDMD) which together seek high quality design and that development should be appropriate to local character.

Living conditions

6. The extension infills the majority of the intervening space with its neighbour, No.209. Whilst there appear to be no habitable rooms directly affected in the flank and rear, the upper parts of the extension and the lower storey of the extension to the front do create a degree of enclosure which is overbearing to the neighbouring property, particularly of its frontage and outlook from principal rooms. This conflicts with Policy DMD8 of the EDMD which seeks that development should preserve amenity of other users. The extension lies on the western side of No.209 such that there would be a slight reduction of access to afternoon sun at certain times and seasons, although, given the dense suburban setting and busy location this would not be experienced as significant.
7. In conclusion, the side extension would have a moderate impact upon living conditions for neighbouring users but the cumulative impact of the extension would unacceptably conflict with the policies of the development plan that I have identified with regard to the street scene and, overall, with the development plan taken as a whole. Consequently, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal must fail.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

² submitted plans do not make this clear