



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3229242

23 Henry Darlot Drive, London NW7 1NP

- 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 Moyez Alwani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/1554/HSE, dated 15 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and alterations to roof to include 2no rear facing rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and alterations to roof to include 2no rear facing rooflights at 23 Henry Darlot Drive, London NW7 1NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1554/HSE, dated 18 March 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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: AD23001 Rev2 Location and Block Plan; AD23003 Rev2 Proposed Plans; AD23004 Rev3 Existing and Proposed Elevations; AD23005 Rev1 Existing and Proposed Sections; AD23006 Rev1 Proposed Section Elevation.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's refusal reason refers to front rooflights, but based on the information before me the appeal proposal was amended during the course of the application and does not include front rooflights. I have therefore taken the description of development from the appeal form and have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the Millbrook Park development on the former Inglis Barracks site. There are a number of different sub phases within the development, each with their own distinct character, which contributes to a diverse modern built environment.
5. No 23 Henry Darlot Drive is a two storey terraced property with additional accommodation in the roof. Like all the properties in the terrace, it has two rooflights to the rear. The rear garden is fully enclosed by timber fencing.
6. The proposed rooflights would result in a total of four rooflights within the rear roof slope. Whilst this would break the uniform line of rooflights in the rear of the terrace, they would nevertheless still be well ordered by being neatly aligned above the existing, well-spaced and matching the existing in size and appearance. Furthermore, the rear roof slope is large. Therefore, even cumulatively with the existing, the rooflights would be small elements in the roof and as such, would not dominate it, or detract from the appearance of the building.
7. Moreover, views of the rear of the property from surrounding streets are minimal and therefore the rooflights would exert only a very limited influence on the character and appearance of the wider area, which in any event, already contains more prominent rooflights and solar panels. Accordingly, the proposal would not be detrimental to the character of the wider locality.
8. The Council does not object to the rear extension, but is concerned that the combination of the rooflights in the extension and those in the roof would overwhelm the rear elevation. For the reasons above and because the extension would be a clearly separate element, with a relatively shallow roof pitch compared to the main dwelling, I am satisfied that the rear elevation would not be overwhelmed by rooflights. I am also satisfied that the rear extension would in itself be acceptable.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. It therefore accords in this regard with Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS)(2012), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012), and the Barnet Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Guidance (2016). Collectively, these seek development which is well designed and respects local context and character.
10. The Council has cited Policy CS01 of the CS in the refusal reason, however this appears to be a strategic spatial policy for new housing and economic growth, and as such, I consider it has limited relevance to the appeal proposal. I have therefore given this Policy only limited, non-determinative weight in my decision and find no conflict with it.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. These are considered necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, I have also included a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match the dwelling.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR