



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/25/3370356

19A Lowden Road, Edmonton, Enfield N9 8RL

- 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 Joe Das against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/01126/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the host building and the area, (ii) the living conditions of neighbouring occupants with regard to sunlight, daylight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is situated on Lowden Road and is a mid-terrace building which is formed of two flats. The terraces in the area are set on consistent building lines and contain features such as bay windows and a similar palette of materials that provide for a harmonious, unified character to the built form.
4. The proposed extension, whilst occupying only the width and part of the depth of the existing ground floor rear outrigger, would by virtue of its size and flat roof form, introduce a box-like addition that would detract from the predominant pitched roof form of properties in the area. Despite the presence of a rear dormer and an outrigger on the appeal property, the first-floor proposal would extend beyond other first-floor elements to the rear of this terrace and consequently, would not sit comfortably or maintain the rhythm of the terrace.
5. Although the proposal would be to the rear on a property which has been previously extended, it would nevertheless be seen in the rear streetscene from various properties due to its elevated position at first floor level. Whilst being confined to private views, this does not negate the adverse visual impact that the proposal would have on the host building and the area.

6. Whilst there is an example of a double depth rear extension on a nearby property¹, I have not been made aware of the full circumstances of that case. From the information provided, it differs from the appeal proposal in that it has a pitched roof form, which although having a greater height than a flat roof design, does reflect the pitched roof form of the area's terraces. In any event, it was evident from the evidence before me, and my site observations, that despite this particular referenced case, there is a generally consistent alignment of first floor outriggers.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such, it would be contrary to Core Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan Core Strategy 2010-2025 (Core Strategy), Policies DMD 8, DMD 11 and DMD 37 of the Enfield Development Management Document (Enfield DMD) and Policy D4 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design that has special regard to their context and for first floor extensions to secure a common alignment of rear extensions. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the Framework which seeks development that is sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

8. The proposed extension would project along the common boundary with No. 17 Lowden Road by around 4m. The nearest first floor window on this neighbouring property is situated a short distance from this boundary. Although there is a difference between the main parties on whether a 30-degree line taken from the mid-point of this neighbouring window would be breached by the proposal, the extent of the projection in close proximity to No. 17 would result in overshadowing and the harmful loss of daylight on the occupants of this neighbouring property. Although the flat roof form proposed would be of a more limited height than a comparative pitched roof design, the proposal would nonetheless present a significant massing that would have a harmful overbearing impact on the occupants of this neighbouring property.
9. Concerns have also been raised on the impacts arising from the proposal on the occupants of No. 21 Lowden Road. Although the appeal property has been subject to previous additions, given the separation of the proposed first-floor extension to this neighbouring property, there would not be an unduly dominant impact arising from the proposal or unacceptable harmful effects arising in relation to the loss of light.
10. Nevertheless, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of No. 17 with regard to sunlight, daylight and outlook. As such, the development would be contrary to Core Policy 30 of the Core Strategy, Policies DMD 8, DMD 11 and DMD 37 of the Enfield DMD and Policies D4 and D6 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that there is no impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

¹ 31 Grosvenor Road

Other Matters

11. The appeal proposal would provide improved family accommodation, but this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issues.
12. The proposed development would retain a sufficient amount of garden space and there would be no harmful effects in relation to privacy. There have also been no objections from neighbouring residential occupiers. These are neutral matters and not ones which weigh in favour of the development.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR