
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/19/3235131
100 The Ridgeway, Enfield EN2 8JQ

- 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 Mrs Amanda Adebawale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/01600/HOU, dated 30 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a side/rear extension of 5m depth.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for a side/rear extension of 5m depth at 100 The Ridgeway, Enfield EN2 8JQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01600/HOU dated 30 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 19565/25; 19565/22; 19565/21; 19565/23; 19565/05; 19565/02; 19565/01; 19565/03; 19565/04 and Location Plan.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area
 - the living conditions of No 98 the Ridgeway, with particular reference to loss of outlook and enclosure; and

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The surrounding area is predominately residential and is characterised by mainly 2-storey semi-detached properties. The proposed extension would be at ground floor level and would replace an existing rear conservatory that is approximately 4.5 metres in depth and measures approximately 2.1 metres along the site boundaries.

4. The Council suggests that other properties in the area have extensions to depths of at least 4 metres and that extensions to 3 metres are common. I acknowledge that the proposed extension is slightly larger than these measurements, however, the height would not be excessive and the monopitch roof design means that it would reduce in height from the area attached to the host property. Whilst the proposed development would be visible from parts of the highway to the side of the property, it would not appear as an unexpected feature within the current pattern of development in the area. It would also match the existing materials of the host property, therefore, meaning it would not appear as a stark feature on the rear elevation. Overall, I consider that the proposed extension would fit in well with the style of the host building and the surrounding area.
5. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would accord with policies 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), Core Policy 30 of the (CS) (2010) and Policy DMD 37 of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield Development Management Document (DMD) (2014). These policies, amongst other things, seek new development to be high quality and design-led and have regard to their context.

Living conditions

6. The site is located on the corner of The Ridgeway and Ridge Crest. The host property is a semi-detached dwelling which shares its rear garden boundary with No 98 The Ridgeway and Ridge Crest. The site is bordered to the rear and side by wooden close board fencing.
7. The appeal proposal would replace an existing conservatory, however, the proposed extension would fill the entire width of the property and would abut both boundaries of No 98 and Ridge Crest. The site benefits from a prior approval application, and in the absence of any substantive evidence that this would not be erected should this appeal fail, it is a fallback position of significant weight.
8. I acknowledge that the development would be right up to the boundary of No 98, however, the proposed extension would have a monopitch roof that reduces in height as it extends out. Therefore, the effect of the extension would not be as pronounced, as it extends further from the host property. This would make the proposal appear less dominant to the adjacent property.
9. The difference between this appeal proposal and the prior approval, would not result in additional harm over and above what the neighbour may experience, should the prior approval be erected. The positioning of the additional extension submitted as part of this appeal would be some distance from the neighbouring property. Therefore, this would not lead to a further loss of outlook or result in a heightened sense of enclosure to No 98.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not significantly harm the living conditions of No 98 The Ridgeway, with particular reference to loss of outlook and enclosure. Despite technical breaches of Policy DMD11 of the DMD (2014), the site-specific circumstances of this appeal mean that the scheme would still comply with the overall living conditions and design aims of policies DMD11 and Policy CP30 of the CS

(2010). These policies, amongst other things, seek new development to be high quality and design-led and have regard to their context.

Conditions

11. I have considered my conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of certainty, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition concerning external materials is not required, as these are clearly indicated on the approved plans.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR