
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3165268

2 Arundel Road, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 9DP

- 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 Thomas Sexton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/5920/HSE, dated 9 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two-storey side extension following demolition of existing outbuilding. Single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory. New front porch following demolition of existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the part single, part two-storey side extension following demolition of existing outbuilding. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and new front porch following demolition of existing porch and planning permission is granted for single-storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and new front porch following demolition of existing porch at 2 Arundel Road, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 9DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/5920/HSE, dated 9 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the single-storey rear extension and front porch: TP/AR/01, TP/AR/03 and TP/AR/04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the single-storey rear extension and front porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Background

2. Planning permission was granted by the Council in November 2016 for single storey extensions to the host building (Ref 16/5786/HSE). I have been provided with a copy of the decision notice and the approved plans for the application and where relevant have had regard to these in reaching my decision.
-

Main Issues

3. 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 64 Northfield Road having regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located in a prominent corner position near to the junction of Arundel Road and Northfield Road. It is predominantly two-storey and has a hipped roof facing Northfield Road. Surrounding dwellings also incorporate hipped roofs and are of a similar design and appearance to the host building. No 64 Northfield Road is positioned at a right angle to the host building and is linked to it at ground floor level. However a visual gap remains between the two dwellings at first floor level.
5. The proposed part single and part two storey side extension would replace the existing single storey linked outbuilding at the appeal site and extend the two storey part of the host building nearer towards Northfield Road and in line with the two storey part of the rear elevation of No 64. Whilst the side extension would be set back from the front elevation and set down from the main ridge of the host building, it would nevertheless be a bulky addition in a prominent position the visual impact of which would be exacerbated by the proposed two storey parapet wall fronting Northfield Road. Such a feature is out of keeping with the character and appearance of dwellings in the immediate vicinity and would serve to obscure the hipped roof of the extension when viewed from the side. In addition the width of the proposed two storey side extension means that the existing visual gap between the two storey elements of the host building and No 64 would be lost, further emphasising the bulk of the extension.
6. The adverse impact of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area is not mitigated by the fact that it would be constructed in matching materials and would incorporate matching fenestration detailing. Though I agree with the appellant that the proposal would not cause any significant visual harm resulting from any loss of symmetry with dwellings on the opposite side of Arundel Road having regard to the relative distance and topography of them and the host building, I do not agree that it represents only a minor increase in proportions when compared with the approved scheme (Ref 16/5786/HSE). Whilst it appears that some of the guidance within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance October 2016 (SPD) has been followed, the prominence of the appeal site together with the juxtaposition of the host building and No 64 means that the particular design and increased height and bulk of the proposed side extension would be harmful to and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
7. No objections were raised by the Council to the impact of the proposed front porch or the single storey rear extension on character and appearance. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's findings on this issue in relation to

these elements of the proposal and note that the proposed porch and rear extension appear to be the same as previously approved by the Council.

8. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that whilst the impact of the proposed porch and rear extension would be acceptable, the proposed part single and part two storey side extension would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. This element of the proposal is therefore contrary to policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (DMP) and the SPD insofar as they relate to character and appearance. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, development of a high quality design that respects surrounding buildings.

Living conditions

9. The two storey part of the side extension would be close to and would in part abut up to existing single storey extensions positioned to the side and rear of No 64. The rear elevation of the single storey rear extension at No 64 closest to the appeal site contains two windows. The window nearest to the boundary with the appeal site is obscurely glazed with the other window appearing to serve a kitchen. The common side boundary between the rear gardens of the two dwellings is at an acute angle relative to these windows and is marked by a solid timber fence.
10. Only a short section of the side extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of the single storey rear extension at No 64 and this section would not be formed by a parapet wall. Though this section would have some impact on the outlook from the ground floor windows and the part of the rear garden of No 64 nearest to the side extension, I do not consider that the impact would be significant having regard to the fact that the nearest window is obscurely glazed, to the overall size of the rear garden at No 64 and to the fact that the existing two storey part of the host building already impacts on the outlook from these windows and from the garden. The part of the side extension that incorporates a parapet wall would have no impact on the ground floor windows in the rear elevation of No 64.
11. No objections were raised by the Council to the impact of the proposed front porch or to the single storey rear extension on living conditions. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's findings on this issue in relation to these elements of the proposal and note that the proposed porch and rear extension appear to be the same as previously approved by the Council.
12. 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 64 Northfield Road having regard to outlook. It therefore accords with Policy CS5 of the CS, Policy DM01 of the DMP and to the SPD insofar as they relate to living conditions. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, development proposals that allow for adequate outlook and that protect the gardens of residential properties.

Other Matters

13. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to a number of other two storey side extensions and I have been provided with photographs of the sites.

However I am not aware of the details or particular circumstances relating to these cases and note that none of the extensions appear to incorporate a parapet wall as is the case with the proposal. In any event I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits.

14. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the fact that the proposal would provide improved accommodation for the appellant and his family and for future occupiers. However this benefit does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that would result from the proposed side extension.

Conditions

15. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the porch and rear extension to be constructed in matching materials. This is to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the side extension and is allowed insofar as it relates to the front porch and single storey rear extension.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR