



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3368926

105 & 105A Monmouth Road, London N9 0JD

- 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 I Kunduru against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
- The application reference is 25/01192/FUL.
- The development proposed is the conversion of 2x single dwelling houses into 4x self-contained flats and erection of a 2-storey side extension, single storey rear extension to 105A to create an additional dwelling unit, with extensions to roof at sides with rear dormers and front rooflights to both properties.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposed development was described on the planning application form as a “two-storey side/rear & single storey rear extension & hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer to create new 1 bedroom dwelling & conversion of existing 2 dwellings to create 4 flats”. An amended description was used on the decision notice issued by the Council, and subsequently by the appellant on the appeal form; I have used that wording in the banner heading above as it provides a slightly more detailed description of the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - The supply of family housing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal relates to a semi-detached pair of three-bedroom houses on the northern side of Monmouth Road. They date from the 1930s or thereabouts, and are typical suburban dwellings of their time with hipped roofs and front gabled two-storey bays; they have shallow front forecourts, and deeper rear gardens. Broadly speaking, along Monmouth Road and elsewhere east of the site the houses are similar in age and style (if not precise detailing) to the appeal property, while to the north, west and south dwellings are generally older and arranged in terraces. The surrounding area is mainly residential, though it is very close to Edmonton Green where shops and services, including public transport connections, are available.

5. The proposed development comprises hip-to-gable roof alterations and rear dormer extensions to Nos 105 and 105A, both of which would be converted to two one-bedroom flats. The scheme also includes a further self-contained two-storey one-bedroom dwelling as a hipped-roof extension infilling the angled side garden at the eastern end of the building; this element would be the same as that allowed by an extant planning permission granted in 2023 (“the 2023 permission”)¹.
6. The contrast between the hipped roof of the side dwelling and the hip-to-gable conversions of the main roof would give the appeal property an unbalanced appearance. The large dormers would occupy almost the entire rear roof slope; contrary to the appellant’s suggestion that they would have “limited visibility from public vantagepoints”, they would be clearly visible from Cornwallis Road to the north, from where they would be seen as bulky and discordant additions.
7. While many houses in the area have gable-end roofs, most of the blocks I saw in the area (whether with gables or hipped roofs) maintain a degree of symmetry. Where different roof types have been used in highly visible locations (such as at Nos 76 and 78 Monmouth Road, where one half of the semi-detached pair retains its original hipped roof form while the other has a gable and rear extension; or at No 24 Ranworth Road, where a flat-roofed side extension sits awkwardly alongside the original hipped roof) the loss of balance has harmed the streetscene. While there may be some large dormers in the locality, they are not usually prominent in public views; where large dormers *can* be seen from the street (an example being at the rear of a property on the west side of Seymour Road, which can be viewed from Monmouth Road in front of the appeal site) their bulk and massing could not generally be said to have enhanced the appearance of the area.
8. The appellant drew my attention to the fact that the Council’s urban design team did not provide specific input during the planning application, noting instead that the proposal did not raise “any significant issues or impacts”. However, to my mind this does not undermine the legitimate concerns raised elsewhere in the Council’s assessment of the scheme.
9. I conclude that the proposed roof extensions and alterations would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore conflict with Core Policy 30 of the 2010 Enfield Core Strategy (“the ECS”), Policies DMD 8, DMD 13 and DMD 37 of the 2014 Development Management Document (“the DMD”), and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is well-designed and sensitive to local character and context (including in respect of bulk and massing), and that roof extensions are appropriate in size and siting, and do not dominate, unbalance, or otherwise disrupt their surroundings.

Family housing

10. The two existing dwellings each have three bedrooms. The main parties agree that the houses “would not meet modern day standards”, and the appellant suggests that is because “room sizes and layouts are poor quality”. The precise nature of these shortcomings has not been explained to me, but based on the submitted layout drawings I infer that it may particularly relate to the small size of the third bedrooms. However, the other two bedrooms in both dwellings appear to be of

¹ LPA Ref: 23/00245/FUL

reasonably generous sizes and, while the third bedrooms might not be optimal accommodation for (say) teenagers or adults, they would provide acceptable bedroom for a baby or young child within a family unit. Furthermore, both dwellings have access to decent-sized private rear gardens which would be suitable for family use.

11. As a question of fact and degree I therefore find that, taken as a whole, it is right that the existing Nos 105 and 105A should be considered suitable for family use. While the proposed development would result in a net increase of three dwellings, it would result in the loss of two houses suitable for family housing. It would therefore conflict with Policy DMD 5 of the DMD, which requires a compensatory provision of family accommodation with three or more bedrooms where existing family units are to be converted into self-contained flats. There would also be conflict with Core Policy 5 of the ECS which seeks to ensure that new developments offer a range of housing sizes to meet need in the borough – I address the appellant's comments about the emerging new local plan on this point below.
12. I find no conflict on this matter with Policy H2 of the London Plan 2021, which seeks to increase the contribution small sites make to meeting housing need in London. However, this does not alter my overall conclusion.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has noted that the hip-to-gable roof conversions and rear dormer extensions could constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) ("the GPDO"). It is conceivable that, in the event of my dismissing this appeal, the appellant would seek to enlarge the appeal property in such a way, and the harm to the character and appearance of the area which I have found above would arise in any event. However, that permitted development right is not available to "a building containing one or more flats, or a flat contained within such a building"², so the GPDO would not allow the loss of family housing without replacement. While the permitted development right may be a fallback position for the appellant, it would not lead to the overall combined harm which would arise from the appeal scheme; it does not therefore carry significant weight in its favour.
14. In respect of the second main issue, the appellant referred to draft policies of the emerging local plan for the borough, which – I am told – does not include a requirement for compensatory family housing provision in line with that currently found in Policy DMD 5 of the DMD. I understand that the emerging plan is going through its examination in public, but I have been provided with very little information about it (including the wording of relevant draft policies, or the extent to which there may be unresolved issues relating to the need for, and supply of, various types and sizes of housing). Based on the evidence which was put to me, I can therefore only give limited weight to the emerging local plan at this stage.
15. The appellant also described the continuing "high need for larger family homes" in Enfield, compared to "a medium need for one-bedroom units" identified in the emerging plan. This suggests that, whatever the precise policy wording eventually settled on, meeting the specific housing requirements of the area is likely to rely, at least in part, on limiting the loss of family housing by subdivision. None of the other

² Section 2 of the GPDO – "Interpretation".

matters raised therefore alter my overall conclusion on the main issues in this appeal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

16. While I have not been provided with precise details, there is no dispute between the main parties that the Council's housing delivery and land supply position is such that, in line with Footnote 8 of the Framework, the most important policies for determining the appeal should be considered out of date, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in Paragraph 11 d) of the Framework applies. As such, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
17. The proposed development would provide a net gain of three dwellings compared to the present position, in an area close to a wide range of services and with good public transport connections. Given the small scale of the scheme, these would represent in total a modest social and economic benefit.
18. However, the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the requirements of the Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places, notably Paragraph 135 which among other things seeks to ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive, and sympathetic to local character. The loss of two family housing units, albeit that they may have some shortcomings when assessed against current standards, means that the development would not provide an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community, as sought by Paragraph 61 of the Framework. I also note that a single additional dwelling could be provided under the 2023 permission without either harming the appearance of the area or leading to a loss of family housing.
19. The harm which would arise from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal would not therefore amount to sustainable development in the terms set out in the Framework.
20. Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 1990 and the Framework state that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector