



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2017

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3177502

7 Trevor Gardens, Edgware HA8 0EY

- 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 F Shareef against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 17/1804/RCU, dated 20 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2017.
 - The development is a single storey rear extension without parapet.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension without parapet at 7 Trevor Gardens, Edgware HA8 0EY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/1804/RCU, dated 20 March 2017, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan 1:1250 and Elevations and Floor Plan Drawing No TR101 dated 20 March 2017.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the extension was in place with two parapet walls running adjacent to the boundaries with both neighbouring dwellings. The appeal scheme shows the parapet walls removed but the extension is the same as built in all other respects. I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to outlook;
 - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Watling Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. Policy DM02 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012) (DMP) states that where appropriate, development will be expected to demonstrate compliance to minimum amenity standards and make a positive contribution to the Borough. Furthermore, Barnet's Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guidance (2013) (RDG) states the depth of a single storey rear extension normally considered acceptable for terraced properties is 3 metres.
5. The single storey rear extension extends some 3.6 metres along the shared boundaries the neighbouring dwellings. Even though the proposed extension would exceed the stipulated 3 metres, it seems to me that the overall aims of Policy DM02 of the DMP and the RDG is to ensure good design and that domestic extensions do not harm the living conditions of nearby residents.
6. In this case the extension, with the parapet walls removed, incorporates a low flat roof. With the parapets removed the extension would not be significantly taller than fencing along the boundary. The majority of the rear garden remains free from development and overall the extension is not overly tall or long or of an excessive mass. Therefore, it is not overbearing nor does it result in any sense of enclosure for the occupiers of either neighbouring dwelling and as such it does not harm the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to outlook.
7. Thus, the development with the parapet walls removed accords with the good design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and the aims of Policies DM01 and DM02 of the DMP and the RDG which seek to ensure good design and that new development does not harm the amenities of nearby residents.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal property is within the Watling Estate Conservation Area (CA). In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
9. The CA is a substantial post war development characterised by dwellings, parkland and commercial uses formally arranged around open spaces. The dwellings are set in reasonably sized plots and constructed from a common palette of materials giving the area a consistent and relatively uniform appearance. In my view, the significance of the CA is derived from its origin as a post war development, the layout of the development and the consistent detailing and character of the buildings within it.
10. I acknowledge that the rear extension is full width and projects some 3.6 metres to the rear of the appeal dwelling. I also note the depth of the unextended original appeal dwelling is some 6.2 metres. However, the extension is not visible from the road. Furthermore, when viewed from the rear garden of the appeal property and the rear gardens of neighbouring dwellings, the extension appears as a relatively modest and proportionate

addition. Moreover, the majority of the rear garden remains undeveloped, such that the appeal site does not appear overly developed.

11. Whilst the materials are not the same as those used on the appeal dwelling, I noticed rear extensions and garden buildings of nearby properties of a broad variety of materials, such that the extension did not appear noticeably out of place.
12. For the reasons given, I find the extension does not harm the character or appearance of the area and thus the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved and the significance of the heritage asset would not be harmed.
13. The extension therefore accords with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and Policies DM01 and DM06 of the DMP. These policies, taken together, seek to ensure good design and that new development makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of an area. For the same reasons the development accords with the aims of the Watling Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal Statement (2007) and the RDG.

Conditions

14. I have noted the conditions suggested by the Council. However, as the extension is in place, commencement or matching materials conditions are not necessary. However, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above the development accords with the development plan and thus the appeal should be allowed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR