
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/25/3367910

8 The Ridgeway, Enfield, Southgate N14 6NU

- 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 and Mrs Miller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref is 25/00891/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension, loft conversion and rear dormer addition, garage front and rear addition, plus roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are a) whether the dormer and rooflights would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Meadway Conservation Area; and b) the effect of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 6 The Ridgeway (No 6) with specific regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

The Meadway Conservation Area (MCA)

4. In part, the MCA is made up of detached and semi detached two storey dwellings set back from and facing the road. They tend to be behind landscaped front gardens and display suburban architecture reflective of the Arts and Crafts and Garden Suburb movements. Design does differ, but there is a familial similarity to their form, scale, key features and materials. Some have been extended, but many (including the appeal building) retain quality in their originality such as forward projecting two storey gables and hips, large span oversailing largely unbroken roofs and repeating bay windows and glazing designs. These elements lend a pleasant traditional aesthetic to the street scene and contribute positively to the significance of the MCA.
5. There are examples of dormer windows and rooflights in the area immediately surrounding the appeal building but these are neither defining nor do they reflect

the quality of the area's group consistency in original architecture terms.

Consequently, and in the case of the appeal scheme, the bulk and scale of the dormer, in spanning two parts of the original roof, as well as the insertion of two rooflights in its public facing slope, would be incongruous additions that would unacceptably erode the period aesthetic of the appeal building when taken together. It's unaltered roofscape specifically. Moreover, the dormer would detract from a feature element of the rear elevation in the shape of the two storey curved bay windows. The fact that the dormer would be to the rear would not lessen its visual influence on the MCA as a whole.

6. As a result of the above, these elements of the appeal scheme would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the MCA. Given its localised effect, the works would be at the lower end of less than substantial in terms of the harm caused, but the conservation of the MCA is worthy of great weight. As per the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals.
7. I have not seen any substantive evidence pertaining to why or how the scheme would secure the optimal viable use of a heritage asset, maintain the vitality of the MCA and its mix of residents, how it would enable families to remain in the area or support the area's demographic mix and community sustainability. Any improvements and extensions to meet incumbent residents' needs would be a private benefit. Improvements to energy efficiency would be welcome in terms of the wider need to make better use of resources, but the limited scope of the works in the grand scheme would equally limit the net contribution they would make. High quality and contextually appropriate design and materials would be expected of such a scheme and thus would not be a benefit.
8. Collectively, and with the above in mind, I would attach limited weight to the public benefits of the proposals, such that they would not be capable of outweighing the harm I have found. The proposed dormer and rooflights would therefore conflict with Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies CP30 and CP31 of the Core Strategy (2010) (CS) and Policies DMD13, DMD37 and DMD44 of the Development Management Document (2014) (LP). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings.

Living Conditions

9. The rear single storey element would have a considerable depth which, combined with the height of the parapet wall which would sit directly on the boundary shared with No 6, would unacceptably impact the otherwise unincumbered outlook the French doors currently benefit from. Whilst the property would continue to enjoy views of its generously sized rear garden, the extension would create a looming and thus unacceptable overbearing effect.
10. Policy DMD8 of the LP requires development to "preserve amenity". However, in relation to rear extensions specifically, Policy DMD11 of the LP states that extensions will only be permitted where there is no impact on the amenities of the original building and its neighbouring properties. Whilst there may be cases where the impact is not significant enough to warrant a refusal, I do not consider this to be the case regarding this appeal. The extensive height and depth of the proposal,

combined with the lack of any set in from the shared boundary to which the French doors of No 6 sit closely to, would result in the proposal adversely impacting the outlook of the occupiers of No 6 in the terms I have explained.

11. Regarding light, No 8 already benefits from a two storey outrigger, and due to it and No 6's west facing gardens, the outrigger is likely to already cause a degree of overshadowing due to the natural track path of the sun. Therefore, whilst the proposed single storey element will project slightly beyond this existing two storey element, the proposal in and of itself is unlikely to significantly worsen any overshadowing.
12. Nevertheless, the single storey element would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No 6 in terms of outlook. Such that the proposals would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policy CP30 of the CS and Policies DMD8, DMD11 and DMD37 of the LP which, amongst other matters, seek to deliver development that has special regard to their local context and maintain appropriate outlook to preserve living conditions.

Other Matters

13. I have alluded to the influence of some dormer and rooflight additions locally and I am aware of the findings of my colleagues in regard thereto. I am also mindful that, of the two examples cited and subject of appeal decisions, the one at Number 7 Meadway is adjacent a dwelling which has a strikingly similar roof alteration, and at Number 15 the dormer is considerably narrower than that which is subject of the appeal scheme.
14. The Council refer to the success of Article 4 Directions restricting the insertion of rooflights in the MCA. I am unaware of when the directions came into force in the context of when the other examples cited were carried out. I am unable therefore to ascribe them more than limited weight in this case, and cannot therefore use their existence as a reason to allow the same on the appeal scheme. I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits, and specifically had regard to the appeal building itself as a largely unaltered example of its type in regard to the harms that I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons I have set out, the proposals would cause harm on the two main issues. This would result in conflict with the development plan. Material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR