



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/22/3300040
40 Mapleton Crescent, Enfield EN3 5RB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ali Uyan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 21/02823/HOU, dated 20 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of existing extension and erection of 2- storey side extension, front porch, single storey rear extension and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of the development, I consider the revised description to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal, accordingly I have adopted the amended descriptions in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The Council considered the effect of the proposed front porch, two storey extension and rear dormer during the determination of the application and raised no concerns, from the information I have before me I do not disagree.
4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension on the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area, characterised typically by two storey terraced and semi-detached properties. The appeal site is an end terraced property, which has been previously extended and altered.
6. Policy DMD11 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (the DMD) seeks to ensure that single storey extensions do not exceed 3m beyond the rear elevation of a terraced property and secure common alignment of rear extensions. The proposed extension projects 6m from the rear elevation.
7. The proposed rear extension would be located adjacent the shared boundary with No. 38 Mapleton Crescent, the neighbouring property has also been

extended. A gap would be provided adjacent the shared boundary with No. 42. I observed during my site visit that the private amenity space to the rear of No. 42 is constrained in terms of size due to the orientation of the property.

8. Whilst I note that there is an existing rear extension I find that due to the scale the proposed rear extension would be stark and dominant to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. In combination with the restricted rear amenity space at No. 42 the proposed development would lead to an overbearing sense of enclosure.
9. I conclude that the proposed single storey rear extension would harm the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties. There is conflict with Policies CP4 and CP30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010), Policies DMD8, DMD10 and DMD11 of the DMD which seeks amongst other things to protect the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR