



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3174255

20 Park Road, Barnet EN5 5SQ

- 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 Mr Anthony Shafar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/4562/HSE, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2017.
 - The development proposed was originally described as a *'two storey rear / side extension and conversion of roof space to form bedroom and shower room'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension at 20 Park Road, Barnet EN5 5SQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/4562/HSE, dated 11 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 872A and 872/2A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no windows or doors shall be inserted into the side elevation of the extension hereby approved facing towards No. 22 Park Road.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application was originally described in the terms set out in the banner heading above. However, it is noted that the loft conversion element was deleted from the proposal prior to its formal determination by the Council. The decision notice also refers to the proposal as being for a *'two storey side and rear extension'*.
3. The appellant also points out, correctly, that there is not a side element to the extension and that the proposal is for a *'two storey rear extension'*. I agree, and I consider that to be a more accurate description of the works proposed and as shown on the submitted plans. Notwithstanding the Council's description of the proposal therefore, I am satisfied that they determined the

proposal on the basis of the plans referred to in my decision above and that no party would be disadvantaged by my adopting this amended description. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The southern side of Park Road is comprised of modestly proportioned detached two storey dwellings. Although there is some variation in house type along this side of the street, the general proportions, scale and massing are broadly similar. The hipped roofs and the spacing between the dwellings provide a pleasing sense of rhythm along the street frontage as ground levels gradually fall to the east, whilst also affording views towards the green backdrop of garden trees and shrubs, behind.
6. The proposed two storey rear extension would fill in the void at the rear of the No.20 created by the angle between the rear face of the main house and the flank elevation of an existing two storey outrigger. The result would be extensions that extend the whole width of the rear of the property.
7. I accept that this did not appear to be particularly typical of the prevailing built form, at least so far as was evident from the rear of the appeal property, but I do not agree that that would, in itself, be harmful. The proposed extension would feature a separate hipped roof with lower ridge and a valley between it and the similar roof form of the existing two storey outrigger. This would effectively break up the roofscape of the existing and proposed outriggers, thereby avoiding a bulky extension whilst also ensuring that the form of the main house's rear roof slope would remain evident.
8. The extension would not be widely visible from the street frontage, the spacing around the dwellings being such that the extended flank wall would only be glimpsed between Nos. 20 and 22. Viewed from directly in front, the proposed extension would not alter the spacing around or between the building and No. 22, or impact upon the views towards the green backdrop presented by the trees behind. In glimpsed views, the extra depth of the extended flank elevation, whilst visible, would not in my judgement be perceived as an overly dominant feature, whilst the lower ridge level of the extension roof would minimise the extension's roof element. Thus, I find that the proposed extension would not alter the spacing between the properties.
9. The regular rhythm of the hipped roofs and the spaces between the buildings and their roofs would also be retained, thereby maintaining the pleasing sense of rhythm along the street which I found to be a distinctive feature of Park Road. Nor would the proposal materially reduce the already generous, south-facing rear garden that the appeal property currently enjoys. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not be a bulky addition to, or out of scale with, the host property. Nor do I consider that it would represent over-development of the site. I am satisfied that the proposed roof form of the extension would avoid the extensions, cumulatively, having a bulky or otherwise adverse effect on the rear of the property, whilst the rhythm and

spacing of, and between, dwellings on the southern side of Park Road would be maintained.

10. The proposal would therefore be consistent with the aims of the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (SPD) and accord with policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) and with policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy (CS). Together, these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality and should preserve or enhance local character by, amongst other things, respecting the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings and streets. In securing high quality design, the proposal would also be consistent with one of the National Planning Policy Framework's core planning principles.

Other Matters

11. Although the proposed extension would project beyond the rear of the adjacent property at No. 22, and be situated at a higher level, I note that it would be separated from that dwelling's flank elevation by the width of its existing driveway. I also noted that there was a detached outbuilding immediately adjacent to the site of the proposed extension. The Council concluded that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of that property and, from my observation of the site and its surroundings, I agree.

Conditions

12. I have considered the list of conditions suggested by the Council in light of the advice set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that in addition to the time limit and plans condition which are necessary in the interests of certainty, a condition to ensure that the external materials match those of the main house is necessary in the interests of character and appearance.
13. Although not expressly suggested by the Council in their appeal questionnaire, it is noted that a further condition was suggested in the delegated officer report should the proposal be allowed on appeal. This seeks to restrict the future installation of windows or doors on the side elevations of the extension facing either adjacent neighbouring property. Whilst I do not consider that to be necessary with regard to No. 18, due to the relationship with the adjacent property at No. 22, I consider that, with amendments, it would be a prudent response to these circumstances. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect, albeit with the amendment described above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR