
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3358903

76 The Limes Avenue, London N11 1RH

- 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 Muhammad Kamran Butt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 24/03330/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 78 The Limes Avenue (No 78), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached house situated within a residential street scene of varied building designs. The dwelling abuts the eastern side boundary and has a double storey outrigger to the rear. This projection extends across part of the width of the main building, such that its eastern flank wall is currently set well apart from the joint boundary with adjacent No 78. The main roof was covered in scaffolding at the time of my visit.
5. No 78 immediately to the east is a two-storey property subdivided into a ground and first floor flat. This building, which has a lower floor level than that of No 76, is set slightly away from the mutual side boundary with the appeal site. No 78's rear garden curtilage is divided in two lengthways by a substantial hedge, such that the ground floor flat's rear partially glazed door and window open onto its apportioned slim part of the garden, which adjoins that of the appeal site. Existing outlook from this rear door and window is already limited due to an external staircase serving the first floor flat, together with the dividing hedge and the massing of the outrigger at the rear of No 76.

6. The Council has not raised any concerns over the front porch, and from a review of the evidence, I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion. My assessment has therefore focussed on the single storey rear extension.
7. The proposal would wrap around the existing outrigger, and would extend across the full width of the dwelling, thereby abutting the eastern boundary with No 78. Though it is designed with a pitched roof, its significant depth, in combination with its siting very close to the shared boundary, would appear as a dominant mass to the occupants of the ground floor flat at adjacent No 78.
8. I accept that the neighbouring building is positioned slightly away from the common boundary, but this degree of separation would not be sufficient to mitigate the additional adverse impact to the existing outlook from the rear window and door caused by the considerable bulk of the development. This negative effect would be further exacerbated by the comparatively elevated level of the appeal site dwelling, which would by virtue of its position and overall massing, appear as an overbearing presence contributing to an increased sense of enclosure of the ground floor flat's already constrained outdoor amenity space near to the building.
9. For these reasons, the proposed rear extension would unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 78, with particular regard to outlook. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy DMD 11 of the Enfield Council Development Management Document 2014, which are directly relevant to the proposal, and which together set a requirement for development to deliver appropriate outlook and amenity, and for residential rear extensions specifically to have no impact on neighbouring amenity.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR