
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3155137
7 Sunset View, Barnet EN5 4LB

- 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 & Mrs Peter & Anny Woodhams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
- The application Ref 16/1234/HSE, dated 24 February 2016, was refused by a notice dated 16 May 2016.
- The development proposed is a rear extension, changes to landscaping and internal alterations.

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 9 December 2016.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear extension, changes to landscaping and internal alterations at 7 Sunset View, Barnet EN5 4LB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1234/HSE, dated 24 February 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: Proposed Ground Floor Plan, SL01D; Proposed First Floor Plan, SL02C; Loft Floor Plan, SL03A; Roof Plan, SL04A; Proposed Section A-A, SL05D; Proposed Elevations 01, SL06D; Proposed Elevations 02, SL07E; Proposed Site Plan, SL08A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and Monken Hadley Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a substantial detached property located within a quiet residential street on the edge of Barnet and within Monken Hadley Conservation Area. The street is characterised by similar attractive houses, each displaying their own individual design characteristics and generally with an Arts and Crafts theme. They are sited on spacious plots. Overall the
-

- relatively consistent scale and form of the properties creates a harmonious suburban street and edge to the town.
4. The special character of Monken Hadley Conservation Area is recognised in its Character Appraisal Statement, 2007 (CA) as its green and leafy appearance which is derived from the large areas of open space within it. There is a strong relationship between the public and private spaces with much of the private space enclosed, but in a way that allows views over the open space and the relationship between them, to be appreciated by the public.
 5. The appeal site adjoins Old Ford Manor Golf Course and the slightly elevated position of the property provides it with clear views across this area of open space. However, it is clearly separated from it by a distinct brick wall, and Sunset View creates a clear border for the golf course and Green Belt boundary.
 6. The proposed extension to the rear of the property would be visible from the golf course. There would also be some distant views of it from the public footpath that runs parallel to the eastern boundary of the course. However, I do not consider that it would appear visually dominant or incongruous. The simple contemporary design, with its low profile, would complement rather than detract from the appearance of the host property. The flat roof design would reinforce the robust horizontal form of the property's rear elevation without disrupting its rhythm. Furthermore, the curved design would reduce the mass of the extension, whilst respecting and complementing the property's existing fenestration.
 7. I noted on my visit to the site that neighbouring properties within the street have also had rear extensions. The appeal proposal would be clearly subservient to the host property and constructed in materials to match it. For these reasons, and those given above, I am satisfied that the extension would respect the character and appearance of the host property. The host property would retain its large rear garden area and it would remain visually distinct from the adjoining golf course. The intrinsic character and appearance of Monken Hadley Conservation Area would therefore be preserved.
 8. I conclude that the appeal proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the host property and Monken Hadley Conservation Area. I therefore find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's policies which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. The proposed development would not conflict with the development plan, and I therefore find no conflict with Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 which seek, amongst other things, to promote sustainable development and protect and enhance the Borough's high quality suburbs. Furthermore I find no conflict with the CA or Policies DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies, Development Plan Document, 2012 and the Council's Residential Design Guidance, Supplementary Planning Document, 2013 which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development proposals preserve or enhance the Borough's Conservation Areas and respect the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to third parties concerns that the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on living conditions of neighbouring residents raising particular concerns in relation to outlook and privacy. Although the extension and patio area would be relatively deep and sit above the existing garden area, I noted that the patio would be no higher than its existing level. Furthermore the existing boundary treatment between the rear gardens provides screening and the proposed extension would be single storey. The Council did not raise any concerns over the impact the extension would have on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, and from my inspection of the site I concur with their views.
10. I understand that that there are concerns from third parties that the extension would lead to the loss of their views of the golf course and set a precedent for future extensions within the Conservation Area. The private views from a window are not in themselves regarded as a planning matter, and are not therefore for my consideration. Each case must be considered on its merits, and in this case I have found that the proposal would preserve the character of the host property and Monken Hadley Conservation Area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and subject to conditions required to provide certainty and safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR