
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/16/3155618

34 Monkfrith Way, Southgate, London N14 5ND

- 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 Ozcan Keles against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/1830/HSE, dated 21 March 2016, was refused by a notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 34 Monkfrith Way, Southgate, London N14 5ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1830/HSE, dated 21 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: Location Plan, PL-000; Block Plan, PL-001; Site Plan, PL-002; Existing Ground Floor Plan, PL-003; Existing First Floor Plan, PL-004; Existing Front Elevation, PL-005; Existing Rear Elevation, PL-006; Existing Side Section/Elevation, PL-007; Proposed Ground Floor Plan, PL-008; Proposed First Floor Plan, PL-009; Proposed Front Elevation, PL-010; Proposed Rear Elevation, PL-011; Proposed Side Elevation, PL-012.
 - 3) The materials to be used in 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 on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site fronts onto Monkfrith Way at its junction with Oak Way. The street displays an open and attractive appearance which is derived from its deep verges, wide pavement and the relatively open front gardens and driveways of the properties which align it. Its open character is reinforced by
-

the wide tree lined central reservation which splits part of the carriageways of Monkfrith Drive and Oak Way and has created a spacious roundabout junction.

4. Residential Design Guidance, Supplementary Planning Document, 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. No 34 has a wide frontage and has been previously extended at ground floor level towards Oak Way. The proposed first floor addition would not extend across the whole width of the ground floor addition and its hipped roof and ridgeline would be stepped down from the ridge of the host property. Furthermore the proposals front wall would be recessed behind that of the original dwelling. Overall the proposal would respect the original design characteristics of the host property and appear subservient to it.
5. There is a deep pavement around the junction of Monkfrith Drive and Oak Way which contributes significantly to giving the junction's spacious appearance. Due to different ground levels the appeal site also sits well below the level of adjoining Oak Way, and consequently the host property's single storey side addition is not visually dominant within the street scene. Although the proposal would introduce development at first floor level, I am satisfied that the junction and street would retain its spacious character. The simple and complementary design of the proposed development, including its restricted width and subservient appearance, would ensure that it would not appear unduly prominent or detrimental to the overall character and appearance of the street.
6. I have had regard to the Council's concern that the proposal would be unduly prominent on Oak Way and would project beyond its established building line. However, the whole of the host property already extends beyond this building line. Moreover, the appeal site sits well below Oak Way, and thus when taken together with the limited width of the first floor addition I do not consider that it would be unduly prominent within the street scene on Oak Way.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. I therefore find no conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan, Core Strategy, 2012 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development conserves or enhances the distinctiveness of Barnet, including its high quality suburbs as an attractive place to live. Furthermore, I find no conflict with Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan, Development Management Policies, 2012 (DMP), which seek 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, nor the SPD the aims of which are set out above.

Conclusion

8. 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

