

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3168800

30 Queens Avenue, London, N20 0JE

- 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 Irene Eile against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/6964/HSE, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed extension on:
 - The character and appearance of the area around Queens Avenue and Orchard Avenue, and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 28 Queens Avenue by way of light and outlook.

Reasons

3. No 30 Queens Avenue is a semi-detached house situated on a corner plot at a point where Queens Avenue turns 90 degrees to the south at its junction with Orchard Avenue. Accordingly, No 30 has a short front boundary facing north onto Queens Avenue and a long side boundary facing west onto that road. The house and plot both narrow to the rear. The house has a two-storey bay window to the front and two, two-storey bay windows to the side, with no primary windows in the very narrow rear elevation.
 4. The proposal would involve the construction of a single-storey side extension which would wrap around the rear elevation. It would have a hipped roof, a blank, rendered side elevation, and a set of patio doors to the rear which would lead onto a new raised terrace. The extension would be some 8 metres in overall length, with a width of a little over 4 metres at its rear elevation, and a height to eaves/parapet of around 3.5 metres. The overall height, including the pitched roof would be around 4.3 metres. The extension would allow for the creation of a new downstairs toilet/shower room and a larger dining/kitchen.
-

Effect on character and appearance

5. Nos 28 and 30 Queens Avenue are not a matching pair, with No 28 being of similar design to the short terrace to the east, whilst No 30 has the appearance of having been built on to No 28 in a way intended to make use of the restricted and irregular corner plot. The current side boundary comprises a 1.5 metre high hedge to the north of the side gate, and a 1.7 metre high fence to the south. The proposed extension would replace some of the hedge, some of the fence, and the side gate, with a boundary comprising a blank wall around 8 metres long by 3.5 metres high. This would fail to respect the character and appearance of the house which currently has a side elevation set over a metre in from the boundary and punctuated with a symmetrical pair of two-storey bay windows, one of which would be partly obscured by the extension.
6. I find, therefore, that the proposed extension, by virtue of its position and design, would fail to respect the character of the host property and would be detrimental to its character and appearance. Moreover, with a long section of high blank wall operating as part of the boundary, it would appear as an incongruous feature in the street scene which would be harmful to the general character and appearance of the surrounding area along Queens Avenue and Orchard Avenue. On this basis it would conflict with Policy CS5 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) and Policy DM01 of its Development Management Policies Document (DMP), which require development to respect local context and to preserve or enhance local character.

Effect on living conditions

7. No 30 has a two-storey rear extension, some 2 metres deep running along the boundary with No 28. No 28 also has a two-storey rear extension, which is considerably longer than that at the appeal property. Between the two rear extensions, in the rear elevation of No 28, is a window with a short mono-pitch roof above. This projects out approximately to the level of the rear elevation of the existing two-storey extension at No 30. The proposed extension at No 30 would project approximately 3 metres further, and would be some 4.3 metres high at the rear elevation dropping to a little over 3 metres at the eaves. This, coupled with the existing extension at No 28, would result in something of a narrow tunnel effect for the outlook from the ground floor window in the rear elevation at No 28, which would be somewhat oppressive.
8. Since the rear elevation of No 28 faces south, it is unlikely that the proposed extension at No 30 would have any significant impact on the existing sunlight and daylight levels reaching the window at No 28. Nevertheless, there would be some detrimental impact on the outlook from the window in that elevation, and although this would not be likely on its own to justify dismissing the proposal, it adds to my earlier concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, as outlined above. It would, on this basis, conflict with Policy DM01 of the DMP, which requires development to allow for adequate light and outlook for adjacent occupiers.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR