
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3156099

74 Church Hill Road, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 8XA

- 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 Mario Ekkeshis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/1448/HSE, dated 5 March 2016, was refused by a notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension above existing ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension above existing ground floor extension at 74 Church Hill Road, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 8XA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1448/HSE, dated 5 March 2016, 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 Plan, Scale 1:1250; Existing Ground Floor, Ref CHR 1; Existing First Floor, Ref CHR 2; Existing Section A-A, Ref CHR 3; Proposed Section B-B, Ref CHR 4; Proposed First Floor Plan, Ref CHR 5; Existing and Proposed Elevations, Ref CHR 6.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Church Hill Road in the vicinity of the appeal site is predominantly characterised by semi-detached properties which display frontage gardens enclosed by low walls and some hedge planting. The properties front towards open parkland and their staggered positioning on the road, together with the
-

differing ground floor levels of the properties, all contribute to the spacious character of the street.

4. The appeal property is located on the corner of Cedar Avenue and has been previously extended at ground floor level towards the road junction. The appeal proposal would extend at first floor level above this extension with a hipped roof stepped below the ridge of the host property and its front wall recessed approximately half a metre behind the property's original front wall.
5. Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan, Development Management Policies, 2012 (DMP) seeks to ensure that new development, amongst other criteria, preserves or enhances local character and respects the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets. Residential Design Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents, 2013 (SPD) advises that extensions should be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building and should normally be subordinate to the original house. The SPD further advises that side extensions should not be more than half the width of the original house, and first floor side extensions should normally be set back 1 metre from the front main wall of the dwelling with rooflines stepped down.
6. The appeal proposal would be situated above an existing side extension which is slightly greater in width than half the width of the original house. This existing extension is poorly designed with a flat roof and parapet. In contrast the appeal proposal would display a hipped roof which would reflect the original design characteristics of the host property and the proposed stepped ridge line and recessed front wall, albeit only by half a metre, would ensure that overall the proposal would appear visually subservient.
7. I noted on my visit to the site that many properties in the street have been extended, and that the scale and form of those extensions vary significantly. The neighbouring semi-detached pair, which is visually aligned with the appeal site, displays both a dominant two-storey side addition with a hip to gable extension and large side dormer. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development which is more sympathetically designed, would not appear visually incongruous, nor would it detract from the appearance of the host property and spacious character of the street scene as a whole.
8. The existing flat roof side extension already projects beyond the building line of properties on the adjoining Cedar Avenue. Furthermore, the entrance to Cedar Avenue is currently dominated by the incongruous two-storey flat roof side addition to No 1 Cedar Avenue which is located immediately to the rear of the appeal site. The proposed first floor addition would partially screen this prominent addition from views on Church Hill Road, and consequently the appeal proposal would overall enhance the visual qualities of both the host property and entrance to Cedar Avenue.
9. I therefore conclude that despite technical breaches of the SPD, the site specific circumstance of this appeal mean that the proposal would still comply with the overall design aims of the SPD and Policy DMO1 of the DMP set out above. Furthermore I find no conflict with Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy, 2012 which seek, amongst other things, to deliver sustainable development which conserve or enhance the local

distinctiveness of Barnet, including its high quality suburbs as an attractive place to live.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and subject to conditions that are necessary to provide certainty and safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR