
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2017

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3181171

14 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 Anupam Bhattacharjee against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 17/1217/HSE, dated 27 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey side extension and two storey side extension with associated alterations to roof and rear projection. Removal of existing chimney breasts. Rendering to first floor front elevation including replacement roof. Alterations to fenestration as per Approval Ref: 16/2705/HSE and additional first floor side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension and two storey side extension with associated alterations to roof and rear projection; removal of existing chimney breasts; rendering to first floor front elevation including replacement roof; alterations to fenestration as per Approval Ref: 16/2705/HSE and additional first floor side extension at 14 Park Road, Barnet EN5 5SQ. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/1217/HSE, dated 27 February 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: location plan, 16/06 (proposed ground floor plan), 16/07 (proposed first floor plan), 16/08 (proposed roof plan), 16/09 (proposed section) and 16/10 (proposed elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions 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 host dwelling and the street scene.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling on the south west side of Park Road and is one of a row of similar property types on this side of the road. There are detached and semi-detached properties on the opposite side.
4. Both main parties refer to the approval of extensions to the appeal property under reference 16/2705/HSE, which is also mentioned in the description of development above. The appellant explains that the current proposal effectively replicates the approved scheme together with some additional development. This involves an increase in the depth of 0.95 of a metre to the single storey extension adjacent to No 16 Park Road, the addition of a first floor extension also adjacent to No 16 and a minor change to part of the front elevation. From my reading of the approved and proposed plans this appears to be the case.
5. The appellant further explains that this earlier approved scheme has not been implemented but remains extant and is the fallback position. In the event that the current appeal should not succeed, given the appellant's aim of extending his property and that the previous scheme forms a large part of the current proposal, I accept that the extant permission is likely to be implemented. As such, I consider that the approved scheme represents a credible fallback position to which I give considerable weight.
6. In these circumstances, the main focus of my consideration of the proposal is the additional development to the approved scheme and its effects, both in its own right and with regard to the other proposed changes to the appeal property.
7. Policy DM01 of the Council's Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (the DMP), Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan all require high quality design in new development and preservation or enhancement of local character. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section seven concerning good design.
8. The Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Design Guidance* (the SPD) provides further details to supplement these development plan policies. It says that proposed extensions should be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building, particularly where it is a period or suburban property; that consistency with the original type of a building can be achieved by respecting the proportions of the existing house and using an appropriate roof form; and that the extension should normally be subordinate to the original house, should respect the original building and should not be overly-dominant.
9. To the rear the addition of less than a metre depth to one side of the single storey extension would have a limited impact. It would not add substantive bulk and mass beyond the approved scheme and would have little additional effect on the space remaining in the relatively large rear garden. The changes to the front elevation from the approved scheme are minimal and would not be materially harmful to the existing property. The most significant proposed addition is the upper storey extension adjacent to No 16.

10. The character of this side of Park Road is of good-sized detached dwellings positioned on broadly consistent building lines and with generally similar sized gaps between buildings. The appeal property is unusual in this regard in that, compared to other dwellings, it has substantively greater separation from its neighbour to either side. The upper floor extension adjacent to No 16 would be set away from the boundary and, together with the extension on the other side, would retain a good degree of separation from the neighbouring properties. Consequently, the extensions as a whole would not result in a cramped appearance to the appeal property or a form of overdevelopment relative to the plot size.
11. No 14 is of similar scale to the properties either side but there are a number of larger dwellings within the road. Therefore, while the extensions would create a wider frontage this would not be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. Like the extension on the other side, the extension next to No 16 would be set back from the building's original front elevation and would have a lower roof height than the existing roof ridge. It would also maintain the same depth as the existing two storey dwelling. Consequently, neither extension is of sufficient width or depth on its own or in combination to detract harmfully from the character or appearance of the original dwelling or its position in the street scene.
12. The appeal property is lent more prominence in the street scene due to its position towards the crest of Park Road as it rises uphill. It is, therefore, positioned on slightly higher ground than No 16. However, the retention of a good degree of separation, the limited rearward projection of the single storey extension and the lack of additional depth over two storeys would not fundamentally alter the existing visual relationship, such that there would be material harm caused from views from this neighbouring garden.
13. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. It is not, therefore, contrary to the development plan policies referred to or to the SPD, as described.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge the concerns raised by neighbouring residents about the accuracy of the representation of properties on the submitted plans. I was, however, able to assess the effects of the proposal fully from the site inspection and appeal submissions. The two first floor windows in the side extension closest to No 16 would include obscured glass as shown on the submitted plans. These would face two windows in the side of No 16. However, the larger one already includes obscured glass and it is unclear which room or area the smaller one serves. These facts taken together with the degree of separation that would be retained between properties means it is not necessary or reasonable to require the new upper floor windows to be non-openable, as suggested. Therefore, while I have had regard to these other matters, they do not lead me to reach a different conclusion.

Conditions

15. Of the Council's suggested conditions I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of the proposal, one

requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree also that a condition requiring the external materials used to match those of the existing building, subject to the details shown on the approved plans, is needed in the interests of the appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR