

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

**by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 1<sup>st</sup> October 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3233119**

**71 Hadley Highstone, Dury Road to Great North Road, Barnet EN5 4QQ**

- 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 Clarke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 18/6766/HSE, dated 8 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2019.
  - The development proposed is a rear single storey extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear single storey extension at 71 Hadley Highstone, Dury Road to Great North Road, Barnet EN5 4QQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/6766/HSE, dated 8 November 2018, 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 (all dated 29.03.19); P104 Rev A - Proposed Ground Floor, P105 Rev A - Proposed First Floor, P106 - Proposed Roof Plan, P121 Rev A - Proposed East (Front) Elevation, P122 Rev A - Proposed West (Rear) Elevation, P123 Rev A - Proposed North Elevation, P124 Rev A - Proposed South Elevation.
  - 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 details shown on the approved plans, the rooflights hereby approved shall be of a 'conservation' style (with central, vertical glazing bar), set flush in the roof.
  - 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or doors other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be installed at any time in the side elevation, of the extension hereby approved, facing 73 Hadley Highstone.

## **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area with particular regard to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Monken Hadley Conservation Area (CA).

## **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling. It has a mock-Tudor timber framed frontage and overlooks a tri-angular shaped area of open space containing an obelisk. The appeal site is located within the Monken Hadley CA that is characterised predominantly by its large green open spaces and residential properties of various sizes and styles. There are also some commercial, religious, institutional, recreational and agricultural land uses within the CA.
4. The appeal proposal extends from the existing kitchen, which is situated behind the garage, and the dining room which is part of the main dwelling. The proposal forms an 'L' shaped extension. The roof of the extension, for the most part, follows the profile of the existing garage roof. Where the proposal extends from the main part of the house, a lean-to roof is proposed. Part of the proposed rear elevation contains a tri-angular shaped glazed section that extends to the eaves level of the proposed roof. Timber cladding is proposed on the rear elevation to match the existing timber cladding above the garage door on the front elevation.
5. The proposed extension would not be readily visible from the street-scene or any other public vantage points. Its form and profile would largely follow that of the existing garage, with the section extending from the dining room being relatively modest and unobtrusive. In the context of the size of the existing property and its gardens, I do not find that the proposal would, by reason of its size, sitting or bulk, appear out of scale or incongruous. The triangular glazed section and the folding doors are not in accordance with the original features of the host property; however, I do not find that they would be overly dominant or cause unacceptable harm. They would not be visible from the street-scene or any other public vantage points. I am satisfied that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
6. The proposed extension would therefore not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Thus, it would comply with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012) and Policies DM01 and DM06 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is of a high quality and standard of design and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the historic suburban environment, including CAs.
7. The proposed development would also be in accordance with the guidance contained within the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) that outlines, amongst other things, that extensions should normally be subordinate to the original house, respect the original building, not be overly dominant and be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building. The proposal would not be contrary to guidance in

the Monken Hadley Conservation Area, Character Appraisal Statement (2007) that sets out the significance of the CA and the management of development within it.

### **Conditions**

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the CA and the host property, it is necessary to impose planning conditions requiring the use of matching materials and conservation style rooflights. In the interests of the living conditions of adjacent residents, it is necessary to impose a condition not allowing any windows or doors to be inserted into the side elevation, other than those as shown on the approved plans.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*A M Nilsson*

INSPECTOR