
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3165209

124 Raleigh Drive, Whetstone, London N20 0XA

- 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 Manjit Matharu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/6354/HSE, dated 30 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension incorporating roof lanterns. First floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to the proposed single storey side extension. However it is clear from the submitted plans that a first floor side extension and not a single storey side extension formed part of the proposal. I have determined the appeal accordingly and assessed the proposal as shown on the submitted plans.
3. The Council granted planning permission for an alternative proposal for extensions and alterations to the host building in November 2016 (Ref 16/5888/HSE). I have been provided with a copy of the decision notice and approved plan for this application and have had regard to them in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area;
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties having regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a part two storey, part single storey detached dwelling located towards the end of Raleigh Drive, close to the junction with
-

Manor Drive. The host building has a distinctive appearance, largely due to the shape of its front gable feature and varied roof form which is covered in green pan tiles. No 116 Raleigh Drive is of a very similar design and appearance to the host building and there are clear views of the roof form of the two dwellings from near to the junction of Raleigh Drive and Manor Drive. The immediate surrounding area is residential in character with dwellings of differing styles and materials.

6. The height and depth of the proposed extension to the main roof of the host building means that the bulk of the roof would significantly increase. This increase in bulk would be particularly apparent when viewed from near to the junction of Raleigh Drive and Manor Drive. At present a large part of the character of the host building comprises its varied roof form, much of which would be lost as a result of the proposal. The proposed roof extension would be incongruous and visually obtrusive and this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and also the surrounding area. Whilst there is some variety in roof forms within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site and some nearby examples of roof extensions, none appear to be as large or bulky as that proposed or located in such a prominent position.
7. Though the proposed first floor side extension would not be set back from the ground floor, it would nevertheless be set back from the front gable feature and would have a lower ridge height than the two storey element to the other side of the front gable. Consequently, I do not share the Council's concerns regarding the lack of set back at first floor. However the proposed crown roof of the side extension would be out of keeping with and add further bulk to the roof of the host building.
8. Whilst I note that the appellants consider the proposal to be more subordinate to the host building than the previously approved scheme (Ref 16/5888/HSE), I do not agree as unlike the proposal the approved scheme leaves the ridge of the main roof unaltered with extensions to the roof being located in less prominent locations to the rear and side of the host building adjacent to No 122 Raleigh Drive.
9. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policies CS NFFF, CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (DMP) and to guidance contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance April 2013 (SPD) insofar as they relate to character and appearance. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, development of high quality design that respects surrounding buildings.

Living conditions

10. Though the height of the side flank wall close to the rear garden boundary of No 90 Manor Drive would increase slightly and whilst the roof height of the side extension would also increase, the significant distance between the rear elevation of No 90 and the flank wall means that there would be no significant loss of outlook from the dwelling at No 90. Whilst there would be some loss of outlook from the very end of the rear garden of No 90, the garden is relatively large and the part of the garden nearest to the appeal site does not appear to

be used as a seating area. Consequently I do not consider that any loss of outlook from the garden is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 90. The position of the side extension means that it would have no adverse impact on the outlook from the neighbouring dwelling at No 122 Raleigh Drive.

11. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties having regard to outlook. It therefore accords with policies CS1 and CS5 of the CS, policies DM01 and DM02 of the DMP and guidance contained within the SPD insofar as they relate to living conditions. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, development proposals which allow for adequate outlook for adjoining occupiers.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties having regard to outlook. However it would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area and is therefore contrary to the development plan when taken as a whole.
13. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR