



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3350845

113 Meadfield, Edgware HA8 8XL

- 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 Madan Songra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 24/1809/HSE.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey ground floor extension 6m from rear wall, flat roof with velux roof lights. Demolition of existing outbuilding on the same side as extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of rear single storey ground floor extension 6m from rear wall, flat roof with velux roof lights following demolition of existing outbuilding at 113 Meadfield, Edgware, HA8 8XL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/1809/HSE and the plans submitted with it, 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: Site Location and Block Plan, Drawing 101 - Existing Elevations, Drawing 102 - Existing Floor Plans, Drawing 103 - Proposed Floor Plans and Roof Plan and Drawing 104 - Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

Reasons

3. 113 Meadfield is a two storey mid-terraced brick house located in an established residential area characterised by similar terraced properties with relatively short rear gardens. It has a detached brick outbuilding to the rear which I understand was built as a single structure which is shared with the neighbour at No. 111 and divided from the latter by an internal wall. The rear

garden steps down from the internal ground floor level of the house and then slopes slightly downwards towards the end of the garden.

4. The relevant policies in this case include D3 of the London Plan (2021), CS1 and CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) and DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (the DMPDPD) which, among other things, require development to be of a high quality design and to protect the outlook of adjoining occupiers. Core Strategy policy CS NPPF is a broadly strategic policy which refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) and provides for granting permission where local policies are out of date unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guide* (2016) (the SPD) provides detailed advice on residential extensions.

Character and appearance

5. The proposed rear extension would project approximately 6m from the house with a width of approximately 3.6m. This is larger than that recommended in the SPD for terraced houses and would perhaps be out of proportion with a property of this modest size. However, I consider that, since it would replace an existing outbuilding, the overall increase in built form would not appear excessive, particularly in the context of other extensions and outbuildings to the rear of nearby properties. It is of simple design and appropriate materials and would remain subservient to the main house. It would not be visible from the street.
6. I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the house itself or the wider area and that in this respect, it is consistent with policies D3 of the London Plan, CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy and DM01 of the DMPDPD and the SPD.

Living conditions

7. The proposed single storey rear extension would project 6m from the rear wall of the house along the common boundary with No. 111. This exceeds the length of rear extensions to terraced houses recommended in the SPD by some 3m. It would have a maximum height to the flat roof of approximately 3.2m depending on the gradient across the site as it falls away from the house, with the highest part being furthest from the house.
8. It would close the existing gap of approximately 1.5m between the rear of the house and the existing outbuilding and would be higher than the existing boundary wall in that gap. It would therefore have some impact on the outlook from the nearest ground floor window in No. 111. However, the existing wall and outbuilding already restrict that outlook and I consider that the difference would not have an unduly harmful effect sufficient to warrant dismissing the appeal. The submitted plans indicate that although it would be wider than the existing outbuilding within the site, it would extend a shorter distance into the garden.
9. I conclude that it would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 111 and that in this respect, it is not in conflict with policies D3 of the London Plan, CS5 of the Core Strategy and DM01 of the DMPDPD and the SPD.
10. The occupier of No. 111 has expressed concern regarding the impact of the demolition on her part of the outbuilding and the party wall. She has also

referred to a shared sewage network. These are subject to separate legislation and regulation and are not a planning consideration.

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR