
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2016

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3159717
54 Manor Road, Barnet EN5 2LF

- 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 Tom Shortall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/2851/HSE, dated 28 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension at 54 Manor Road, Barnet EN5 2LF in accordance with the terms of application Ref 16/2851/HSE, dated 28 April 2016, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached brick built dwelling falling within an established residential area. It is proposed to erect a two storey rear extension following the partial demolition of an existing single storey rear projection. Both the ground and mezzanine extensions would have flat roofs. The mezzanine part of the extension would be about 6.6 metres in height and would be set back from the proposed ground floor extension. Proposed external materials would match the existing dwelling.
 4. I acknowledge that the proposal includes flat roofs. However, there are flat roofs on the rear of the property already. Therefore, I do not consider that the proposal would be unacceptable in this regard.
 5. The proposed window proportions at mezzanine level would not be too dissimilar to the existing window proportions on the remainder of this part of the rear elevation. Furthermore, I do not consider that the amount of glazing to the proposed mezzanine level would be excessive. I acknowledge that a relatively large amount of glazing is proposed to the ground floor extension. However, there would be brick piers either side of the glazed opening, thereby ensuring that the glazed area does not take up the full width of the extension.
-

In any event, this part of the development would not be conspicuous from public areas taking into account the position and height of the boundary treatment/landscaping.

6. In conclusion, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area or the host dwelling. The development would be proportionate in scale to the host dwelling, including the retention of a large rear garden, and would be acceptable in terms of its appearance. Therefore, the proposal would accord with the design aims of Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document 2012; Policy DM01 of Barnet's (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012 and the Barnet Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2013.

Other Matters

7. The Council made reference to a Juliette balcony in its refusal notice as well as a side extension. The proposal does not include a Juliette balcony or a side extension.
8. I have considered the effect of the proposal upon the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties. I note that no objections have been received from the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties, and I have no reason to disagree with the conclusion reached by the Council that the proposal would not have a significantly adverse effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of such dwellings.

Conditions

9. The conditions set out in the accompanying schedule are based on those suggested by the Council. Where necessary, I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions, in the interests of precision and clarity, and in order to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. Otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.
11. In the interest of the character and appearance of the area, a planning condition is necessary relating to materials.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 red edged location plan; 451816/01; 451816/02 and 451816/03.
- 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the building shall match those used in the existing building.