



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by R Pankhurst

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3368054

72 Evesham Road, Southgate, Enfield, N11 2RN

- 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 Gaza Sufaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00678/HOU.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor rear extension.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. I am aware of two other appeal decisions in respect of 72 Evesham Road, APP/Q5300/D/25/3368054 and APP/Q5300/D/25/3361195, both of which were prior approval appeals. I dealt with, and made the recommendation for, APP/Q5300/D/25/3361195 and therefore there are some descriptive elements which are the same in both that recommendation and this one. However, for the avoidance of doubt, I have considered them separately, on their own merits, and in accordance with the relevant procedure for each appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and local area and on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants of 70 and 74 Evesham Road, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is in a residential area comprising groups of terraces. The fronts of the terraces are generally uniform in appearance, however, there is considerable variation at the rear. There are ground level changes along Evesham Road with a downward slope towards Telford Road. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace house with an existing flat roofed single-storey rear extension that is about half the width of the rear elevation.

6. The proposal would see the replacement of the single-storey rear extension with a two-storey extension which would not be as deep but would extend across the full width of the appeal property. The proposal would not be visible from the street and although it would be visible from neighbouring properties, there is already a mixed character at the rear of properties in the local area. This includes various other flat roof structures at the rear of properties in the local area, including rear box dormers and single-storey extensions.
7. The proposal would have a flat roof rather than a gable roof like the host property and would be the only first-floor extension on the rear of this terrace. However, the proposal would be of limited depth and height and use matching materials, so would not be visually obtrusive. Furthermore, there are a variety of alterations and extensions present in the terrace and other roof and first-floor extensions visible in the local area. In this context the proposal would not look out of character or be an incongruous form of development.
8. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or local area and would therefore comply with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CP30 of the Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025 (adopted 2010) (Core Strategy) and Policies DMD 11 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (adopted 2014) (EDMD) insofar as these policies seek to ensure that developments are high quality, having special regard to their context.
9. The Council has referred to DMD 8 in its decision, however, this Policy is for new residential development so has not been determinative in this appeal.

Living Conditions

10. Policy DMD 11 of the EDMD requires first floor extensions not to exceed a 30 degree line taken from the mid-point of the nearest first floor window of adjacent properties. The policy seeks to protect the living conditions of neighbours from harm. Nevertheless, the specific context and relationship between properties in each case will determine whether such a breach would be harmful or not. While I appreciate that an alternative measure is used by other authorities, as the appellant points out, I must consider the proposal in relation to the adopted development plan of this Council.
11. No 74 has a single storey rear extension which extends across the full width of the property but does not project as far out as the existing rear extension of the appeal property. The outlook from the ground floor rear windows of No 74 is down its own rear garden. A broader outlook is available from the first-floor windows, with views into the rear garden of adjoining neighbour No 76. The outlook towards the appeal site from the rear windows of No 74 and its garden is limited due to the change in ground levels and the existing extension, which is considerably taller than the boundary fence.
12. The proposal would likely be in breach of the 30 degree line set out in Policy DMD 11 in relation to No 74. However, the proposal would only project a short distance past the existing rear extension at No 74 and there would be gap between the proposal and the shared boundary. Therefore, it would have very little effect on the outlook from the ground floor rear windows of that property. From the garden of No 74 the proposal would be seen against the taller main dwelling and terrace and the

proposed flat roof would limit its height. As a result, it would not appear harmfully overbearing from the garden of No 74.

13. The nearest rear first-floor window of No 74 appears to be a bathroom with obscure glazing, which therefore already has limited outlook. Consequently, although the proposal would be visible from this window, the impact on the outlook from this room would be very limited. The other rear first-floor window is set far enough away from the proposal that it would have a limited effect on its otherwise open outlook. Overall, therefore, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 74 in relation to outlook.
14. Given the orientation of No 74, its rear elevation and garden is already shaded by the terrace for much of the day. The existing rear extension on the appeal property shades part of the rear garden of No 74 in the morning. Although the proposal would be taller than the existing rear extension, it would not be as deep. Therefore, it is unlikely to result in greater shading of the garden of No 74 compared with the existing situation. While it would slightly increase shading of the roof of the rear extension and bathroom of No 74 in the morning, this would not result in a harmful reduction in light to any habitable spaces. Consequently, while the proposal would result in a slight reduction in light to No 74, it would not be sufficient to harm the living conditions of the occupants of that property.
15. No 70 does not have a rear extension, and the existing outlook from the ground floor rear windows is across the garden, limited to one side by a single storey rear extension to the rear of 68 Evesham Road. The outlook from the first-floor windows of No 70 is broader, encompassing the properties at the rear and the gardens of both adjoining properties. The existing rear extension of the appeal property is visible from the rear garden due to its height and depth, despite No 70 being on higher ground with a section of taller fence. However, as the existing extension is set away from the boundary it has a limited impact on the outlook from No 70.
16. While the depth of the proposal would be less than the existing rear extension, it would be two-storey and closer to the shared boundary with No 70. The proposal would therefore likely breach the 30 degree line set out in Policy DMD 11 of the EDMD. Although No 70 is on higher ground, due to its height the proposal would be very visible from its rear garden and would be a dominant feature in the outlook from the ground floor window. It would create a significant sense of enclosure for the occupants of No 70, particularly given the presence of the very visible rear extension of No 68 which sits close to the other side boundary. Consequently, the proposal would harmfully reduce the outlook from the garden and ground floor rear window of No 70, to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupants.
17. The proposal would also limit the outlook from the nearest first-floor rear window of No 70. It would retain an open outlook to the rear and other side, therefore the impact would be modest, however this cumulative impact on another rear window would add to the harm to the occupants' living conditions in terms of outlook.
18. The appellant claims No 70's habitable rooms have been reconfigured and are used as extended living spaces, such that an alternative outlook exists. I have not however been provided with any substantive evidence of this. I therefore give this very little weight and it does not outweigh the harm I have identified in terms of outlook.

19. Given the orientation of No 70, its rear elevation and garden is shaded by the terrace for much of the day. The existing rear extension on the appeal property is unlikely to shade No 70 due to its distance from the boundary. The proposal is likely to result in some additional shading of No 70's patio area but for a relatively short period during the afternoon. Given the extent of existing shading from the terrace and other existing development, this additional shading would be very minor and therefore would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 70 with respect to light.
20. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in a harmful reduction in light to Nos 70 or 74 or result in an unacceptable loss of outlook for the occupiers of Nos 74. However, it would harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 70 through an unacceptable loss of outlook. The lack of harm in other respects does not outweigh that harm. While the appellant indicates that they would accept conditions to protect neighbours' living conditions, no suggested conditions have been put before me and there are none that would satisfactorily address the harmful impact of the proposed development.
21. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DMD11 of the EDMD insofar as it requires that development have no impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would also fail to accord with Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan, Policy CP30 of the Core Strategy and Policy DMD 37 of the EDMD insofar as they seek development which makes a positive contribution to quality of life and has regard to surrounding housing.

Other Matters

22. In their Appeal Statement, the appellant has referred to the possibility of building a single-storey rear extension up to 3 metres deep without planning permission under rights granted by the General Permitted Development Order. However, this would have a very different impact on neighbours than the appeal proposal due to the limited height allowed by the Order, and therefore would not be comparable. I therefore give this fallback very limited weight, and it does not justify the harm identified above.
23. The proposal would make efficient use of already developed land, as supported by the National Planning Policy Framework. However, it has not been demonstrated that it would meet a recognised local need for a particular type of housing. The proposal would provide additional accommodation for the occupiers, however this is a private benefit. These matters therefore carry very limited weight and do not justify the harm set out above.
24. My attention has also been drawn to extensions and a new dwelling with single-storey and two-storey rear projections at 97 and 97A Evesham Road. No 97 is an end of terrace dwelling and the adjoining neighbour also has single-storey rear extension of around the same depth as the rear extension at 97A. The first-floor window of No 97 closest to 97A also appears to be a non-habitable room with an already limited outlook. Therefore, the relationship between the two properties and the effect of the two-storey extension in that case is similar to the relationship of the appeal proposal with No 74 but markedly different to the relationship with No 70. Consequently, that scheme does not justify the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

R Pankhurst

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

26. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR