



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by Joanna Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/20/3252630

15 The Ridgeway, Southgate N14 6NX

- 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 and Mrs Greenway against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 19/04290/HOU, dated 16 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extensions, and enlargement of existing loft, formation of a rear facing dormer and installation of conservation-type rooflights to front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extensions, and enlargement of existing loft, formation of a rear facing dormer and installation of conservation-type rooflights to front and rear elevations at 15 The Ridgeway, Southgate N14 6NX, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/04290/HOU dated 16 December 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the following approved plans 1309/10; 1309/11; 1309/12; 1309/13; 1309/14; 1309/15 Rev E; 1309/16 Rev F; 1309/17 Rev E.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, or any amending Order, no external windows or doors other than those indicated on the approved drawings shall be installed in the development hereby approved without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer 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 whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Meadway Conservation Area (MCA).

Reasons

4. The MCA's significance is derived from its layout and range of detached and semi-detached houses influenced by the Arts and Crafts and Garden Suburb movements, which lie within a spacious landscaped setting of vegetated front gardens, trees and planted verges. The houses within the MCA vary in design with limited exact repetition of house types, but a range of architectural features and materials are used across the MCA, providing a unity of design.
5. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached house on the eastern side of The Ridgeway within the MCA. It forms part of a pair with 11 The Ridgeway. Nos 11 and 15 are identified within the Meadway Conservation Area Character Appraisal (June 2015) (MCACA) as contributing to the special interest of the area. Given the architectural style and form of the appeal property, I consider that it makes a positive contribution to the MCA.
6. The proposed development includes a rear extension and rear dormer window extension, which the Council has not raised concerns about. I do not disagree with their assessment of these elements of the proposal. The Council's reason for refusal is focussed on the proposed two-storey side extension.
7. In order to avoid a terracing effect, Policy DMD14 of the Enfield Development Management Document (November 2014) (DMD) states that at least a one metre gap from the boundary should be maintained for side extensions. The MCACA confirms that gaps between houses usually occupied by older single storey garages are being filled in. It asserts that such gaps are important for separating houses and to give glimpses of the green setting beyond.
8. The adjacent property at 17 The Ridgeway has extended up to the shared boundary with a two storey side extension which is set immediately behind the house's chimney, while No 11, part of the handed pair, has a two-storey side extension which is slightly set back behind the asymmetric pitched roof of the garage and set in from the boundary to allow access to the rear garden.
9. At ground floor level, the proposed side extension would represent a reduction in the existing house's width as the lounge and kids playroom adjacent to the boundary with No 17 would be removed and the proposed side extension would maintain an approximately one metre gap between it and the boundary at the frontage to allow access to the rear of No 15. Although the gap between the rearmost point of the proposed side extension and the boundary would diminish slightly due to the garden's tapered nature, a reasonable gap would be maintained, and the gap would represent an enhancement as it would be considerably larger than the existing situation.
10. At first floor level, the proposed side extension would be set back from its ground floor at the front while also being set in significantly from the side of the ground floor garage and from the property's boundary with No 17. In terms of its design and its modest scale, the proposed side extension would enhance the property's symmetry with its handed pair at No 11 and would maintain a suitable gap at first floor level between Nos 15 and 17.

11. Other properties on The Ridgeway have also been extended to the side. Many of these are of some age and likely pre-date the MCA's designation. However, the gaps between properties are generous and given the modest width of the proposed side extension, the treed backdrops of rear gardens identified in the MCACA would remain visible in this instance. Given the use of matching materials and sympathetic design, the width and siting of the proposed side extension would not have a detrimental visual impact on the street scene.
12. The MCACA states that modelling of roofs is varied within the MCA and that the proximity of houses to each other means that there are complex and interesting roofscapes in many views. The proposed side extension's roof design would be hipped to match that of the host building. Although there would be some small areas of crown roof, these are minimal in their effect, particularly when viewed in the context of other existing crown roofs along the Ridgeway. The MCA has a range of roof styles and forms, especially when seen collectively, and the development would be in keeping with the host property and other roofs in the street scene so as to not adversely affect the character and appearance of the MCA.
13. A previous appeal decision¹ at No 15 included a two-storey side extension rather than the part single, part two-storey extension in this appeal. I have no plans relating to that appeal before me. However, each proposal is assessed on its own merits and allowing this appeal would not set a precedent for future applications in the area.
14. I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the MCA. Consequently, it would comply with Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Enfield Plan Core Strategy (November 2010), DMD Policies DMD37 and DMD44, Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (Consolidated with alterations since 2011) (March 2016), the National Planning Policy Framework, the Meadway Conservation Area Management Proposals (June 2015), and the MCACA. These policies and guidance seek to protect local character and heritage assets. It would also meet the statutory tests set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. While it would not be entirely consistent with DMD Policy DMD14, there are mitigating factors which indicate that the conflict with the one metre requirement is acceptable in this instance. London Plan Policy 7.5 does not appear to be directly relevant in this instance as it relates to public realm.

Other matters

15. Although concern has been raised about the level of discussion with neighbours prior to submission of the application, I have a duty to consider the appeal on its merits. With regard to light and privacy, the Council has not raised concerns in this respect, and I can see no reason to disagree with the Council's findings.
16. While there are no detailed plans of the front garden provided, the Direction made under Article 4 (2) removes permitted development rights for the provision of hard surfacing where it would front the highway. A planning application would be required for such works. In terms of trees close to the proposed development, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires owners to notify the Council of any intended works to trees

¹ APP/Q5300/D/14/2229467, decision issued 27 February 2015.

on private land within conservation areas. This allows the Council to assess and protect trees.

Conditions

17. It is necessary to specify conditions confirming the time limit for development and approved plans to ensure clarity and certainty. In addition, a condition on the use of matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. The condition restricting insertion of further windows or doors is necessary in the interests of neighbouring living conditions.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Joanna Gilbert

INSPECTOR