
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: 19 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/17/3169698

159 and 161 Bittacy Hill, Mill Hill, London NW7 1RT

- 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 Ms N Murphy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/6726/HSE, dated 18 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is two modern two storey terraced houses which are part of a larger staggered terrace. No 159 is an end of terrace dwelling and has a part single storey / part two storey extension to its rear. At present No 161 has a single storey rear extension.
 4. The current proposal is for first floor rear extensions to both properties of approximately 2.6 metres projection from the original rear wall of the properties. The proposed extension to No 159 would have a width of approximately 2.1 metres and the extension to No 161 would have a width of approximately 3.6 metres and be positioned between the existing first floor extension on No 161 and the proposed extension to No 159. The proposal would result in extensions along the entire width of No 159 and more than half the width of No 161.
 5. Given the relatively modest proportions of the existing pair of properties the proposal would represent disproportionately large additions which would dominate the rear of the properties and detract from their character and appearance. At ground floor levels the properties have different eaves heights and consequently the height of the proposed extension to No 161 would be slightly higher than that proposed for No 159. Furthermore, the proposed smaller infill extension to No 159 would have a reduced height. Therefore, as a consequence of the different eaves heights and overall heights of the
-

extensions the proposal would result in an incongruous, clumsy and visually intrusive development

6. I understand that the proposal does not relate to a Listed Building, nor is the site located in a Conservation Area. Although the proposal would not be particularly visible from the public realm it would be highly visible and intrusive to its immediate surroundings from where the harmful effect on the host properties would be evident.
7. I have no evidence of the planning officer's original recommendation being overturned and, in any case, the decision of the Council was to refuse planning permission for the reasons specified in its decision notice.
8. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and as such would conflict with Policies DM01 and DM02 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012 and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016. 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.

Conclusion

9. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR