
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/W/19/3233073

13 Barnard Road, Enfield EN1 3QA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rikki Ewart against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 18/04878/FUL, dated 26 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with outbuilding at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with outbuilding at rear at 13 Barnard Road, Enfield EN1 3QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/04878/FUL, dated 26 January 2019, 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 following approved plans; PP2588-001 SHT 1/2 REV A; PP2588-002 SHT 2/2 REV A; DD2588-001 SHT 1/2 REV A; DD2588-002 SHT 2/2 REV A; Ground Floor Plan and Roof Plan; Front Elevation, Side Elevation (1) and Side Elevation (2) Rear Elevation; Site Plan; Site Location Plan.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development on the application form does not include reference to the proposed outbuilding. For clarity, I have included the outbuilding in the description of development subject to this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 11 Barnard Road with regard to outlook and dominance.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a ground floor flat. It is located in a residential street of predominantly two storey houses, many of which have been extended.
5. The development includes an outbuilding in the rear garden that replaces a previous outbuilding of a similar siting. This element of the proposal is not in dispute. The development also includes a single storey extension to the rear. There is a side path between the appeal site and 11 Barnard Road that has boundary treatments of around 1.8m in height on either side. When viewed from 11 Barnard Road, the proposed single storey rear extension would be visible above the existing fences, however most of it would be screened. The proposed flat roof would mean that only around 1m of the extension would be visible above the existing boundary treatments when viewed from 11 Barnard Road. The use of a light cream coloured render to match that of the existing dwelling, would also contribute to reducing any dominance or overbearingness.
6. I find that given the relatively small amount of the extension that would be visible, combined with its design and materials, and the positioning of windows in 11 Barnard Road, there would not be an overly dominant effect or the creation of an unreasonable sense of enclosure or an unreasonable loss of outlook for the occupiers of that property.
7. The proposed extension would therefore not have an unreasonable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 11 Barnard Road with regard to outlook and dominance. Accordingly, it would comply with Policy CP30 of the Enfield Core Strategy (2010), which seeks, amongst other things, to deliver quality design. There would be minor conflict with Policy DMD11 of the Enfield Development Management Document (2014), however this conflict would not result in unreasonable harm.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR