
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 22 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3156538

'Donna', 7 Willenhall Avenue, New Barnet, Hertfordshire, EN5 1JN

- 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 Stuart Greenberg against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/2151/HSE, dated 1 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as '*first floor rear extension*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. An earlier appeal (ref 3139238) was dismissed in March 2016; with the Inspector finding in that case that whilst the impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would not be unacceptable, the proposed design would be harmful. The appellant has sought to address the character and appearance issue which arose in that appeal, and I have taken into account both that decision and the evidence before me in forming my main issue and the matters raised.
3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a large detached chalet style property with low eaves on the front elevation facing Willenhall Avenue and a number of pitched roof dormers. To the rear, the property is a full two storey in height, with a single storey extension projection on its eastern side. This single storey extension has a depth roughly equal to the rear garden area, with the garden mainly formed of a swimming pool and patio area.
5. The proposed extension comprises a first floor extension over the existing single storey rear projection. Compared to the first appeal (ref 3139238), the appellant has sought to address the Inspectors concerns by changing the roof form from a mansard style to a full length flat roof. I appreciate that the existing dwelling is of a slightly mixed design and the proposed flat roof would replicate the existing flat roof of the single storey rear projection. However, even with the change in the roof style proposed from the earlier appeal, the considerable depth (which the officer report suggests is around 11.5 metres)

and overall height would result in a large and bulky addition which would neither be subordinate to the main dwelling, nor a sympathetic addition to the building.

6. As a result, the proposed extension, even with the amended roof form, does not overcome the concerns raised in the earlier appeal decision in respect of the harmful effect on character and appearance. What is more, in considering the appeal scheme on its own merits, I do not find that it would complement the character or appearance of the existing dwelling owing to the bulk and scale of the proposed first floor extension and its depth to almost the rear of the plot, at a two storey height with a flat roof.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development, by reason of its large and bulky appearance, would have a materially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host building and thus the area more generally. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DM01 of the *Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012* and Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the *Local Plan Core Strategy 2012*, as supported by the Residential Design Guidance SPD 2013, which amongst other aims seek to ensure that development is sustainable and provides the highest standards of urban design that respects local context and distinctive local character.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR