

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3167401

4 Uphill Road, Mill Hill, London NW7 4RB

- 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 Mrs S Morar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet
 - The application Ref 16/7298/HSE, dated 16 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey extended detached dwelling. It is located in a residential area, characterised by extended and/or altered detached dwellings that largely fill the width of their plots.
 4. The appeal property, like other houses in the street, is set back from the road behind a parking area and has a garden to the rear.
 5. During my site visit I observed that, whilst there tends to be little room between dwellings, the presence of trees, public open space and rear gardens provides for a sense of greenery and spaciousness. Also, whilst house types and alterations/extensions tend to vary in style, a general respect for the original character of dwellings and the general maintenance of a regular building line, particularly above ground floor level, provides for a pleasant sense of uniformity.
 6. This latter characteristic is a particular feature in respect of the appeal property, which shares a similar building line to the properties to either side, both to the front and rear, reinforcing a positive sense of uniformity.
 7. The appeal property has an existing two storey rear extension. This reaches to a similar rear building line to that of neighbouring properties at Nos 2 and 6 Uphill Road, both of which project to the rear in a similar manner.
-

8. The proposed development would result in a significant two storey extension to the existing extension. This would result in a large and dominant feature, which would draw attention to itself due, in large, to the proposed projection at first floor level which would extend well beyond that of neighbouring dwellings. As a consequence of this, I find that the proposal would draw attention to itself and appear as an unduly dominant and disproportionate addition to the host property.
9. The harmful impact of the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed hipped roof, which would lead the proposal to appear as an ungainly extension, out of scale with the dwelling's existing hipped roof and large dormer window. The overall effect of this and the above would be an extension that would fail to appear subordinate to the host property and which would not respect the uniform attributes of the area identified above.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012) Policies DM01 and DM02, and the Council's Residential Design Guidance (2016), which together amongst other things, protect local character.

Other Matters

11. The appellants, in support of their case, bring my attention to the presence of other "considerably bigger" extensions elsewhere along Uphill Road. However, there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that other extensions elsewhere are so similar to that before me as to provide a precedent for the development proposed. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposal would result in harm to local character and this is not, in this case, something that is outweighed by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
12. I acknowledge that the appellants would like to extend the first floor to accommodate a relative with ill health. However, this does not, in this case, amount to a planning matter that outweighs the harm identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR