



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3358303

61 Blakesware Gardens, Edmonton, Enfield N9 9HX

- 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 Ora against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield
 - The application Ref is 24/02892/HOU.
 - The development proposed is 4.8m single storey rear extension with internal alterations to ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development the living conditions of occupiers of No. 63 Blakesware Gardens.

Reasons

3. The site is located within a predominantly residential area, the appeal property is a mid-terraced house. The proposed rear extension would extend the full width of the site. The adjoining property No. 59 Blakesware Gardens has been extended to the rear at single storey, No. 63 Blakesware Gardens does not have a rear single storey extension to the rear.
4. The proposed development would project beyond the rear elevation of the extension at No. 59, notwithstanding this the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 59.
5. The proposed extension would project 4.8m along the shared boundary with No. 63 with a wall height of approximately 3.3m from the ground floor level. The slightly mono pitched roof would be lower than the side wall and contain a lantern rooflight. No. 63 has a large bay window close to the shared boundary.
6. Due to the scale the proposed rear extension would be stark and dominant to the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No. 63. I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 63 Blakesware Gardens.
7. There is conflict with Core Policy 30 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) and Policies DMD8 and DMD11 of the Enfield Development Management

Document (2014) which seeks amongst other things to protect the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments approved by the Council. I have not been provided with substantive details to consider the context of the sites and compare these to the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this I note that the majority relate to prior approval applications. Each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR