
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3169749
66 Wise Lane, Mill Hill, London NW7 2RG

- 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 Helena Berman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/6253/HSE, dated 23 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension including new front porch with a new drive level and steps to the garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension including new front porch with a new drive level and steps to the garden at 66 Wise Lane, Mill Hill, London NW7 2RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/6253/HSE, dated 23 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: 001 P2, 002 P1, 005 P1, 100 P1, 101 P1, 103 P1, 301 P1, 302 P1, 303 P1, 110 P2, 111 P2, 113 P2, 200 P2, 311 P1, 312 P2 and 313 P1.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a large two storey semi-detached residential property in a predominantly residential part of Barnet. The property forms a pair with No 64 Wise Lane. There is a wide variety of residential properties along Wise Lane of different ages, materials, layouts and designs. There is no distinct building along the north side of the road, where the appeal property is situated and properties are considerably set back from the highway on substantial raised
-

and sloping plots. The street in the vicinity of the site is verdant in character with mature trees and vegetation providing screening of the property from different angles in the public realm.

4. Many properties along the street have been altered over time, including roof alterations and rear, side and front extensions with pitched and flat roofs. Other properties appear to have been rebuilt or re-clad. The pair of semi-detached properties is unbalanced as a consequence of the side extension to the appeal site and the garage and flat roofed dormer window at No 64. Separation distances along the row of properties are also irregular. Overall, there is little architectural uniformity in the locality.
5. The proposed extensions do not project beyond the existing front elevation of the property and a porch and refuse store would be created under the roof of the extension. It is proposed to be a flat roofed addition with red brick and white render walling. A raised planter is also proposed to the front of the property in order to cover the excavation required to level off the drive. Large aluminium powder coated windows are proposed for the main front (south) elevation.
6. There is no predominant architectural style or character to the street scene and the proposal would not have an uncharacteristic appearance that would be harmful to the overall verdant suburban and spacious character of this residential area. There would be no disruption to any strong building line and it would not unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses which has already been compromised by alterations and extensions that have already taken place. The most important features of the pair, being the pitched roofs, projecting bay windows and shared chimney would not be compromised by the proposal.
7. The materials proposed would not be at odds with others used in the locality, but would provide a contemporary finish to the extensions. The flat roof would not match the existing property, but would not be a dominant feature owing to the fact that the property is significantly raised above street level and views would largely be obscured by existing landscaping in the street scene. As such, the extensions would be subservient to the host property. Furthermore, although the arrangement of openings does not match the existing building the relatively large expanse of glazing would provide a contemporary elevation facing the street.
8. There is variety in the height and scale of properties in the locality and the additional height of the extension required to accommodate the change in levels would be covered by a raised planter which would also serve to mitigate any concern of a significant increase in exposed height at the front of the property. As such, I do not consider that this part of the proposal would be harmful to the host property or the street scene generally.
9. Although the proposal includes some features which contrast with the host property I find that in its context the proposal would be an appropriate modern and subservient extension which would not relate poorly to the existing property and would not be visually harmful to the original house, the pair of which it is part or the area.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would be in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document 2012,

Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012, the Supplementary Planning Document : Residential Design Guidance 2016 and the National Planning Framework. These seek to achieve the highest standards of design, protect and enhance Barnet's character, ensure that development enhances the Borough's high quality suburbs and minimise the impact of extensions on the local environment by being consistent in regard to the form and architectural style of the original building, among other things.

Conditions

11. I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty and I have also imposed a condition requiring samples of materials to be submitted to the local planning authority in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be allowed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR