



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3373459

28 Boleyn Avenue, Enfield EN1 4HS

- 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 Erdal Pehlivan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/01773/HOU.
 - The development proposed is Part single, part 2 storey side/rear extension, and relocation of the front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant provided amended plans to the scheme. These have not been formally consulted upon and therefore I have discarded them as part of my assessment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the street scene.

Reasons

4. Boleyn Avenue is a broadly linear in layout and consists of pairs of two storey semi detached houses and short terraces of houses flanking both sides of the avenue. I note that the pattern of the street scene is noted for dwellings following the curve of the road are in the main laid out as pairs of semi's, and the rest of the houses consist of short terraces of houses. As a planned avenue, the houses share much of the same design characteristics and therefore there is a coherency to the built form here.
5. Number 28 is an end dwelling in a short row of four houses. The row is bookended by the houses with double height walk in bay windows and a peaked gable end over to the front. The main entrance is to the side of the dwelling.
6. The proposal is to extend the dwelling by way of a two storey side/rear extension and reposition the front door into the new extension. Its building line would be substantially set back from the front elevation of the dwelling with a flat roof over and a slight gap with the adjacent semi of No 26 Boleyn Avenue. This adjacent dwelling is located on the sweep of the avenue and has also been extended by way of a two storey flat roofed side extension.

7. As a narrow and flat roofed extension set back from the front building line, in this location it would be at odds with the character of the host dwelling and the row it sits within, especially as this dwelling is a bookend dwelling. As an extension it would not respect the character of the terrace when viewed from the front façade, appearing at odds in this context.
8. No 26 is semi-detached and has been extended by virtue of a two storey side extension built up to the side boundary and its building line flush with the existing front building line. The front building line of the proposed extension would virtually align with the side of the neighbour's dwelling given the setback and not adhere to the required gap between dwellings of 1m as advocated in the Council's local policy DMD14. The narrow gap between the two dwellings would appear insignificant.
9. As the houses share similar design characteristics and the extension would be flat roofed built from matching materials and in line with the adjacent neighbour with a minimal gap between, the proposal would have the effect of these four houses and the semi's effectively becoming one complete row. Local policy DMD14 advocates avoiding creating a terracing effect to maintain the character and appearance of the street scene.
10. Overall, the proposal would not represent a well-integrated extension in this location and would therefore the cohesiveness of the street scene would be adversely compromised.
11. I understand from the evidence presented that there are a number of extensions to houses seen locally, although some are single storey level only and cannot be compared to the appeal proposal. The two storey examples I saw include a hipped roof to correspond with the original roof, and most of the houses are not handed in the same way as the appeal site, or bookend houses. I note the extensions brought to my attention largely relate to semi-detached houses positioned on corners. These are not precisely the same circumstances as the appeal site as the splay between houses is more marked than the proposal before me.
12. Other examples relate to only one dwelling having been extended to two storey level, and not the adjacent dwelling. In any case, I am not furnished with the precise details of these examples to fully consider and as a whole, the examples brought to my attention do not compare. Therefore, I apportion them minimal weight in the overall scheme of things.
13. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not accord with the good design objectives of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), and the same aims of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan, as well as policies CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010) DMD14 and DMD37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) in their broad requirements to secure good design principles. I am however not of the view that the policies DMD6 and DMD8 are relevant to this proposal as they relate to density and new residential development.

Other Matters

14. The appeal site may not be situated within an area with statutory designations. Be that as it may, the proposal is required to accord with the good design principles of local policy. There may be no adverse effect of the proposal on the living conditions

of local residents. This is however neutral in the overall scheme of things and neither weighs for or against the proposal.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR