



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3360541

3 Swansea Road, Enfield, EN3 4JG

- 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 A Azad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/04291/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side/rear and single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side/rear and single-storey rear extension at 3 Swansea Road, Enfield, EN3 4JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/04291/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan: Drg No A24-111-01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions at 1 Swansea Road with particular regard to visual impact and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a predominantly residential area on the east side of Swansea Road. To the north the appeal site adjoins a detached, two-storey dwelling at No 5 which is associated with the adjacent Southbury Primary School. To the opposite side is the attached neighbouring property at No 1. No 3 has previously been extended to the side and rear with a single-storey flat roof addition. The proposal would include a first-floor side/rear extension over part of the existing extension with a pitched roof and flat crown, and which would wrap around part of the existing rear elevation at two-storey. A flat roofed single-storey element would span the width of the remaining rear elevation up to and adjoining the shared common side boundary with No 1.

4. The ground floor rear extension would project 3.5m deep along the boundary with No 1, which is unextended to the rear. The Council is concerned that the extension would give rise to an unneighbourly loss of outlook, sunlight and daylight when seen from 1 Swansea Road.
5. Section 4.5 of the Council's Development Management Document (DMD), adopted in 2014, addresses residential extensions. DMD Policy DMD11 deals specifically with residential rear extensions. Amongst other things it requires a single-storey extension to not exceed 3m in depth beyond the original rear wall in the case of terraced and semi-detached properties, or to exceed a line taken at 45-degrees from the mid-point of the nearest original ground floor window to any adjacent property.
6. The extension would project 0.5m deeper than the limits set out in Policy DMD11 and would breach a 45-degree line projected from the mid-point of the nearest ground floor rear window at No 1. Nevertheless, I observed that the garden to No 1 is large and wide. To the rear it backs on to similar sized gardens to properties in Glyn Road, with unobstructed views obliquely to the south over the bottom end of the deep neighbouring garden at 384 Southbury Road. Moreover, the nearest ground floor window to No 1 is set away from the shared boundary with No 3. Whilst I have no doubt that the extension would be seen obliquely in any outlook from this window, it would be domestic in scale and proportionate to the existing dwelling such that its flank elevation would appear neither overly large nor excessively deep within the context of its setting. Its width would be immaterial when perceived from No 1, and overall, given the open and expansive nature of this adjoining rear garden, I am not persuaded that the ground floor, single-storey extension would impose itself upon the neighbour's outlook in any way that would be overly dominant or intrusive, including when seen from the rear garden.
7. For similar reasons, and without any substantive evidence provided to the contrary, I am satisfied that levels of daylight within the neighbour's living space would not be impacted to any degree that would be harmful. No 1 is situated immediately to the south side of the proposed extension. There would be no potential for the extension to cast any shadow over the adjoining property and no direct loss of sunlight to any part of the neighbour's garden or living space.
8. For the reasons given, I find that there would be no harm to the living conditions at 1 Swansea Road. I therefore find no conflict with DMD Policy DMD37 or Core Policy 30 of the Council's Core Strategy, adopted in 2010, as far as they both require a high-quality standard of design for new development, including residential, which has appropriate regard to its surroundings. For the same reason I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

9. In the event of the appeal succeeding the Council has suggested three conditions. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I agree that a condition is also necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in materials to match the existing, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. Notwithstanding the conflict I have identified with part of DMD Policy DMD11, without any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, material considerations in this case lead me to conclude that the appeal should succeed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR