
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 11 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3179172

6 Oaklands Road, London, N20 8BA

- 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 T Aleator against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 17/2551/HSE, dated 18 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension to kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension to kitchen at 6 Oaklands Road, London, N20 8BA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/2551/HSE dated 18 April 2017, 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: Site plan; 1489.P.01; 1489.P.02.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling which occupies a corner plot within the Totteridge Conservation Area (CA). The CA is predominantly residential, and its general character is informed by its pleasant rural location. The Totteridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal Statement (CAS) describes Oaklands Road as an area of limited merit.
4. The proposal would create a single storey extension to the rear of No 6. The Council's document entitled 'Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance' (SPD) sets out design principles for residential extensions. For rear extensions, the SPD advises that these should not look

too bulky or prominent compared to the size of the main building and garden to which they relate.

5. The proposed extension would project to a depth of around 3m, which is well within the recommended depth of 4m for extensions to detached properties. The roof form, materials and general design of the extension would keep in with those of the existing house. In terms of the overall scale and proportions, I am satisfied that the new extension would appear subordinate in relation to the main dwelling.
6. The Council's concern is that the proposal would further erode a garden plot that has already accommodated a larger property than that which had previously occupied the site, and would reduce the open space between properties. The submitted site plan shows that the garden plots vary in size in the vicinity, but are mostly generous, as is the plot at the appeal site. I note that an outbuilding has been constructed within the plot. This structure appears to have been constructed in the corner farthest from the main house, leaving most of the garden open. Similarly, the proposed extension would, in my view, leave a garden area that would be in keeping with the scale of No 6, and would not unduly reduce the space between the properties in the vicinity.
7. On my site visit, I noted that that plot is enclosed by a tall fence. As a result, the extension would have little, if any, visual impact on the street scene. From my observations, I conclude that the appeal site and its surroundings are neutral in terms of their contribution to the significance of the CA. The development too would be neutral in terms of its impact, and so the statutory duty to preserve the character and appearance of the Totteridge Conservation Area would be satisfied.
8. I therefore find no conflict with Policy CS1 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS), which amongst other things seeks the highest standards of urban design, or CS Policy CS5, insofar as it aims to ensure that development in Barnet respects local context. The proposal would also accord with Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DMP), insofar as it requires that all development should represent high quality design, and DMP Policy DM06 and the National Planning Policy Framework, which jointly seek to protect heritage assets. Finally, it would comply with the advice given in the SPD.
9. There is little substantive evidence before me to show that the proposal would harm the amenity of neighbouring properties. I have taken into account the letters of objection to the proposal, but these have not led me to a different conclusion on the main issue.

Conditions

10. For certainly, it is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Gray INSPECTOR