

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/16/3156046

71 Ravensdale Avenue, North Finchley, London N12 9HR

- 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 Rob Lacey, U-Design Developments against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/2744/FUL, dated 25 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of one two-storey three bed house and re-building of existing garage to slightly larger footprint.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Design SPD) (2013) has been superseded by an updated version of the document which was adopted on 5 October 2016. The overall thrust of the document is the same in relation to the pertinent issues of the appeal. I have, therefore, taken it into account in my reasoning below.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the existing occupiers of no 71 Ravensdale Avenue with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site forms the rear/side garden of no 71 (no 71) Ravensdale Avenue situated on a corner plot on the junction of Ravensdale Avenue and Friary Road. Ravensdale Avenue is characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached properties with bays to ground and first floors and shallow pitched roofs. Properties are set in spacious plots with front gardens enclosed by low boundary walls fronting onto the tree lined avenue.
 5. The host property, no 71 forms part of a pair of semi-detached properties which has a hipped main roof and hipped set back two storey projection to the
-

- side. The rear and side garden is situated on the corner adjacent to Friary Road and contains a number of mature trees. The garden contributes to the verdant and spacious feel to the area.
6. The proposed development would maintain the building line of the north side of Ravensdale Avenue and would have a similar foot print. It would also have a similar ridge height to that of the main roof of the host property and incorporate some features which reflect those of the traditional properties in the street such as the bays to the ground and first floors.
 7. However, the proposal would result in the loss of the side/rear garden which contributes significantly to the verdant and spacious feel to the area. In addition, the proposed dwelling would occupy almost the entire width of the site resulting in a cramped appearance at odds with the spacious character of the area.
 8. Furthermore, the mass and bulk of the proposed steep pitched gable ended roofs would appear top heavy and dominate the proposed dwelling. I acknowledge that the ridge of the roof would be similar to that of the host property and surrounding properties. However, those properties have shallow pitched roofs which are also in some case hipped which helps to reduce their mass and bulk. Furthermore, the proposed roof would be significantly higher than the hipped roof of the two storey side projection of no 71 which it would be seen in context with from the rear. The appellant indicates that he would be willing to change the design of the proposed roof; however, no amended plans have been submitted and I must, therefore, consider the proposal before me.
 9. The fenestration pattern of the proposed two storey side extension would not reflect that of surrounding properties. The windows would be situated in close proximity to the main house resulting in a high proportion of solid wall on the front and rear walls of the side extension. In addition the proposed red tile cladding would not reflect local materials in the area.
 10. Moreover, the proposal would occupy a highly prominent location on the corner of Ravensdale Avenue and Friary Road. The mass and bulk of the gable ended roofs would create an imposing side elevation when viewed from Friary Road detracting from the existing gateway feature created by the open garden and mature trees.
 11. Taking these factors in combination, I conclude that the proposal would result in an incongruous feature which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 12. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policy CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) (2012), criteria a and b of Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies (DMP) Development Plan Document 2012 and chapter 6 of the Design SPD (2016) which collectively seek to protect and enhance Barnet's character to create high quality places.

Living conditions

13. The proposed single storey extension would extend 5m beyond the neighbour's rear elevation. No 71 has a patio area which is used for sitting out by existing occupiers who currently have a view of the rear and side garden. However, the proposed extension would be 2m from the boundary and would not extend significantly above the proposed boundary fence. Furthermore, occupiers of

the host property would retain the view of their rear garden. Consequently, I consider that the relationship of the proposed extension to the host property would be similar to that found in many residential areas and indeed would be reflective of that which could be built under permitted development rights.

14. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would not have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 71. The proposal would not, therefore, be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Barnet Core Strategy which seeks, amongst other things, the highest standards of urban design and to create an accessible safe and attractive environment for people who live in, work in or visit Barnet. No conflict would arise with criterion e of Policy DM01 of the DPD which states that development proposals should be designed to allow for adequate daylight, sunlight, privacy and outlook for adjoining and potential occupiers and users. Furthermore, no conflict would arise with chapter 7 of the Design SPD.

Conclusion

15. The proposal would have some social benefits by way of a contribution, albeit limited, to housing land supply. However, I have concluded that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This harm would not be outweighed by my findings that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of existing occupiers or the contribution the proposal would make to housing supply. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to the development plan as a whole.
16. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector