

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3171034

4 Linden Road, New Southgate, London N11 1ER

- 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 Bilal Ahmad against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 16/6707/FUL, dated 19 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side and rear extension to incorporate a larger family room, kitchen, bedroom and bathroom with disabled features throughout. The loft space to be increased with the construction of a dormer to the rear while the front of the roof will have skylights installed.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect that the appeal proposal would have upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Linden Road, with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site relates to one half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows situated within a residential street which predominantly comprises two storey housing. The rear elevation of no2 is slightly set forward than that of no4 and is on lower ground.
4. I note from the planning history that two Lawful Development Certificates were granted in 2001 and 2004 for a single storey rear extension and alteration to front elevation; and single storey rear extension, although neither were implemented.
5. Furthermore, planning permission was granted for a single storey side and rear extension in 2005, this was not implemented either. However, the Planning Officer's Report makes no mention of a material change to the policy context appertaining to residential extensions within the Development Plan, notwithstanding the fact that since those decisions were made, the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) (CS) and the Development

Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012) (DMP) of Barnet's Local Plan have been produced.

6. I note that planning permission N12747B/04 permitted a single storey rear extension of 4m in depth, to span the entire width of the original dwelling, in addition to that of a proposed single storey side extension. There are material differences between that and the proposal before me, in particular the form of roof proposed over the side element which previously was shown to be of flat roof construction. The proposal before me identifies the side extension as having a front elevation flush with that of the existing bungalow and with a continuous ridge and eaves line I consider that this extension alone, by virtue of its impact upon the street scene, would fail to demonstrate sufficient subordination.
7. Combined with the rear projection of a total of 6m and the construction of a box dormer across the whole of the roof both existing and as proposed to be extended, I find that the scheme would give rise to a significant increase in bulk to the overall form of the bungalow. The proposal conflicts with the Council's Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (2016) (RDG) which states that extensions should normally be subordinate to the original house, respect the original building and should not be overly dominant.
8. In addition, and as recognised by the appellant, the RDG also states that dormer roof extensions should normally be a subordinate features on the roof and should not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof slope. Whilst it may be that sometimes larger roof dormers can be considered acceptable, and I acknowledge that the rear dormer would not extend the ridge line of the host property and neither could it been seen from the public domain, nonetheless, it would add considerable bulk cumulatively with all of the other aspects of the proposal, subsuming its original modest scale. I say this, notwithstanding the proposed use of facing materials that would blend in with the existing dwelling and the fenestration that would largely replicate that found of the original dwelling.
9. I also accept that no4 is positioned adjacent to a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings, and that to the east of nos 2 and 4 on the adjacent garage site planning permission has been approved for their demolition and the erection of a two storey house and a two storey building comprising 4no self-contained flats. However, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
10. On this matter I find that the proposed extensions would in totality, by reason of their siting, overall scale and design represent disproportionate, overly dominant and incongruous additions to the host property, which would give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached properties of which it forms part and the wider area. The proposal conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015) CS Policies CS1 and CS5 and DMP Policy DM01 which require proposals to provide a high quality design response and be of a proportion, composition, scale, and orientation that enhances and appropriately defines the public realm in addition to the advice as set out within the RDG, with respect to domestic extensions.

Living Conditions

11. Application Ref. 15/03684/PNH determined that prior approval was not required for a single storey rear extension with a proposed depth of 6m from the original rear wall. This is also material to the proposal before me, notwithstanding the fact that no Certificate of Lawfulness has been sought in respect to this.

12. I accept that at 6m deep the proposed single storey rear extension would be of a significant depth and would exceed the RDG's 3.5m guideline. However, the decision that Prior Approval is not required for a 6m rear extension cannot be ignored and there is no substantive evidence before me which suggests that this would not be built out in the event of an unsuccessful appeal. Therefore, from this basis I conclude that the proposal would not have a significant impact upon the living conditions of 2 Linden Road by way of outlook, this doesn't however outweigh the harm that I have found stemming from the proposals as a whole, upon the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR