



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3368037

28 Mayfield Crescent, London N9 7NH

- 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 V Osanu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00632/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a detached rear outbuilding with a crown roof, habitable roofspace, dormer and side rooflights to be used as an annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issues

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The main issues for which are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Numbers 26 (No. 26) and 30 (No. 30) Mayfield Crescent, with specific regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an extended end terraced dwelling, backing on to dwellings fronting Woodpecker Close. A partially enclosed single-storey L-shaped brick structure is located to the back of the rear garden. In the immediate area, rear gardens are characterised by their open generous size, featuring typical standard garden paraphernalia, including sheds and outbuildings of limited height and footprint. This consistent pattern contributes positively to the area's overall sense of spaciousness and visual cohesion.
4. The proposed development's crown roof, dormer window, rooflights, and full garden width would significantly increase its scale, giving it the appearance of an independent dwelling rather than a subordinate outbuilding to the host dwelling. Back land development is not typical in this locality, which is characterised by minimal built form in these places. The proposal would appear disproportionately large and visually intrusive compared to the surrounding garden structures. As such, it would present as a dominant and incongruous feature, unacceptably eroding the spacious and consistent feel to the area. It would be visible from the

public highway to the rear of the appeal site further amplifying its visual impact and highlighting its incompatibility with the established surroundings.

5. As a consequence, the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (London) (2021) (SDS), Policy CP30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy (2010), and Policies DMD8, DMD12 and DMD37 of The Enfield Development Management Document (2014) (DMD), and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure new development is of high quality and be of appropriate height and bulk so as not to adversely impact on the character of the local area.

Living Conditions

6. The proposed annexe would be positioned along the boundary with No. 30 and slightly inset from No. 26 due to an existing passageway. Its height would result in a dominant and visually intrusive form, creating an overbearing effect, diminishing the quality of outlook for garden users of No. 30. Additionally, the elevated rooflights, positioned above the boundary fencing and internally aligned at chest height, would enable direct views into the rear gardens of both neighbouring properties, leading to an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of both Nos. 26 and 30. Accordingly, the appeal proposals would be contrary to Policy D3 of the SDS and Policies DMD8 and DMD12 of the DMD, which, among other objectives, seek to uphold acceptable living conditions for neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

7. While the proposal would offer additional living space for a family member, this private benefit does not outweigh the significant harm identified against both main issues. The approved and extant single-storey annexe scheme is a fallback position. However, and due to its substantially smaller scale, it is not comparable to what is proposed as part of this appeal and specifically the harms I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR