
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2nd December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3160840
31 Whittings Road, Barnet EN5 2QX

- 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 P Ashby against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/4535/HSE, dated 10 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear extension on the first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located in an established residential area. The appeal property and its neighbours have a uniform appearance from the street frontage with a distinctive catslide roof. At the rear, there are a number of ground floor extensions present on neighbouring properties. There is a large first floor extension which is located at the rear of the neighbouring property, No 29 Whittings Road.
 4. The proposed first floor extension would measure 3m in width, 3.4m in depth and 2.6m in height. It would be set in from the side boundaries on the rear of the host property. As a result of the existing roof form and the size and scale of the proposed extension, it would appear as a bulky and box like addition to the rear elevation of the property and this is emphasised by the side elevation provided on drawing WH102. It would be out of scale with the host property and would fail to respect the existing proportions and scale of the host property. It would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host property and as such would conflict with the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2013.
 5. The appellant has referred to the existing first floor extension at the neighbouring property, No 29. I was able to see this extension during my site visit. I accept that the proposed extension is similar in scale and form to this existing feature. I also acknowledge that the proposal would make the two properties more symmetrical. However, the Council have advised that this
-

extension does not benefit from planning permission. In any event, the presence or otherwise of existing unsympathetic development is not in my view sufficient justification to allow more. Reference has also been made to another extension at 18 Langton Avenue. From the information presented, this proposal and existing property do not appear to relate in scale, form or massing to the appeal site and the proposal before me. The similarities I can draw between the two sites are therefore limited.

6. I therefore conclude the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be in direct conflict with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015) as well as the SPD referred to above. Policy 7.4 relates to local character and seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area. Policy 7.6 advises, amongst other things, that buildings and structures should be of the highest architectural quality. In addition, the proposal would also conflict with policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies (2012) which advises, amongst other things, that all development should represent high quality design and should preserve or enhance local character.
7. My attention has also been drawn to policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy (2012). Policy CS1 is an overarching strategic policy and policy CS5 is also a strategic policy which relates to creating high quality places and protecting and enhancing Barnet's character. Taking into account the policy wording, I am not convinced that these policies are directly applicable to the main issue before me.

Other Matters

8. Concerns have been raised by the occupiers of No 29 Whittings Road that the proposal could lead to a loss of light. Taking into account the orientation of the dwellings and the existing first floor extension in place, I am not convinced that the proposal would give rise to any material harm in this regard.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR