



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3376356

Land adj to 2 Bilton Way, Enfield EN3 6EW

- 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 Mrs Shanly Villejo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00355/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of two-storey detached two bedroom dwelling house, installation of vehicular access, creation of off-street parking, provision for cycle and refuse storage, associated landscaping and boundary fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reason

3. The appeal site is within a residential area, although there are a number of large commercial buildings to the south. As such, the established layout and architecture in the wider area is varied. However, the dwellings on Bilton Way are two storey and semi-detached, resulting in a simple rectangular built form, with a horizontal emphasis. They are also set back an equal distance from the road, and their front elevations establish a strong building line; and large side gardens, and areas of open space at junctions are largely free from development above ground floor level. These factors contribute to a consistent rhythm of development and pleasing uniformity, and gives the area an open and spacious quality.
4. The proposal is for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with parking for one car and gardens to the front and rear. The appeal site is located on a grassed area of open space, adjacent to the side boundary of 2 Bilton Way; at the junction of Bilton Way and Marrayne Avenue. The dwelling would have a simple built form, and as it would be detached it would be narrower than other buildings in the area. The external elevations would be finished in white cladding and facing brick, with grey roof tiles. The dwelling would be angled in comparison to 2 Bilton Way, as a result the front elevation would be set at an angle to the road, deviating from the established building line facing the street. It would also be forward of the building line of the neighbouring properties on the southern side of Marrayne Avenue.
5. The proposed scheme would result in a two storey development on a large portion of what is currently a grassed area of open space. In order to be accommodated within the plot the proposed dwelling would be angled in relation to Bilton Way; which would

deviate from the established building line. Further, as the dwelling would be detached it would appear narrow, with a vertical emphasis, and would appear incongruous when viewed alongside the semi-detached properties in the vicinity.

6. It is acknowledged that there are instances where infill developments, maximise the efficient use of land and create an opportunity for a unique design approach. However, the built form of the proposed dwelling combined with its angled position would appear as an incongruous and constrained form of development on a site at a prominent junction; eroding the sense of openness in the area. An absence of heritage assets or planning constraints on the appeal site does not resolve my concerns in this regard.
7. For the reasons detailed above the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan, Core Strategy 2010-2025, and Policies DMD6 and DMD8 of the Improving Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) 2014 (DMD) which seek to promote attractive neighbourhoods and ensure that the scale and form of development is appropriate to the existing pattern of development; only permitting proposals that are of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing.
8. Policy DMD7 of the DMD refers to the development of garden land. Based on the evidence before me, including my site visit, the appeal site is not garden ground. Therefore, this policy is not determinative of the scheme before me.

Other Matters

9. My attention has been drawn to an application for the subdivision of the site at 1 Bilton Way and erection of an end of terrace dwelling house that the Council recently approved¹. However, this scheme would result in the creation of a terrace of three dwellings, would reflect the established building line and retain the horizontal emphasis of the rectangular built form which is characteristic of the area.
10. My attention has also been drawn to 1A Bideford Road, a small bungalow in the vicinity of the appeal site that was also approved by the Council². But, the dwelling is significantly smaller than the appeal proposal and is set back from the road reflecting the established building line of the properties on Bideford Road.
11. As well as the dwellinghouses detailed above, the appellant has also referred to development in the side gardens at 2 Marrilyne Avenue and 92/94 Lytton Avenue. Details of the permission for these developments have not been provided. However, in both of these instances the development resulted in the continuation of terraced development on garden ground, rather than a two storey detached dwelling in an area of open space. As such, I cannot be certain that the circumstances in the examples provided are the same as the appeal before me.
12. The Council raised no concerns in relation to proposed external materials and boundary treatments, the size of dwelling proposed, living conditions of both future occupants and neighbours, parking provision, highway safety, refuse storage and biodiversity. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree in regard to these matters. Still, an absence of harm is a neutral factor weighing neither for nor against the proposal.

¹ 25/00638/FUL

² 21/01258/FUL

Planning Balance

13. The proposal conflicts with the aforementioned development plan policies, and with the development plan when read as a whole. Proposals that conflict with the development plan should normally be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
14. The Council has confirmed that there is a shortfall in the housing land supply, in such circumstances paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged, and the appeal falls to be considered against the test set out in paragraph 11d)ii. of the Framework.
15. I have identified that harm would arise in relation to the character and appearance of the area. This harm leads to conflict with the Framework, which expects development to provide well-designed places.
16. Benefits would arise in terms of the contribution of an additional dwelling to local housing supply, which accords with the Framework's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing for different groups in the community. The proposal would improve the efficiency of the land by increasing the residential output of the site, in a well-established residential area. The Framework also recognises that small sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of an area and are often built out relatively quickly.
17. Additional benefits would arise through the creation of construction jobs. Environmentally, the dwelling could also feasibly achieve high sustainability standards. These benefits weigh in favour of the proposal. However, the contribution that would be made by a single dwelling would be modest, therefore I ascribe the benefits limited cumulative weight.
18. Taking all of the above into account, and even if there is a significant shortfall in the housing land supply position, the adverse impact of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole and having particular regard to the policies referenced in footnote 9. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development would not apply.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR