



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2019

by N Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/19/3225197

9a Jackson Road, East Barnet, Barnet, EN4 8UT

- 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 Ms Lynda Kennedy against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 18/6682/FUL, dated 6 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor rear extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. I have adopted the description of development from the Council's decision notice, rather than that set out on the planning application form because I consider that it better reflects the appeal proposal. I also note that the Appellant has used the same description in their appeal statement.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey building used as two flats. It has a rear addition with a 'catslide' roof. I saw on my visit that these types of roofs were a characteristic of properties around the appeal site. The appeal proposal is for a first-floor rear extension across part of the rear of the building. It would have a different pitch to the 'catslide' roof and where the original roof of the rear addition connects with the house below the eaves of the main part of the building, the proposed roof would finish about midway up the main rear facing roof slope of the building.
5. The design of the extension would conflict with original built proportions of the existing building and an important aspect of the character of the rear of the building would be lost because a large amount of the 'catslide' roof would be masked by the proposal. The extension would constitute a bulky and unsympathetic addition to an attractively designed building and would appear uncharacteristic when viewed against other properties around the site.

6. The Council's Residential Design Guidance 2016 states that extensions should be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building. The appeal proposal would not follow that guidance because of its design, scale and siting.
7. I accept that views from the street of the extension would be limited and that alternative materials could be used so that they matched those used in the existing building, but these factors do not persuade me that the proposal would be good quality design, which is important regardless of whether it can be seen from public viewpoints.
8. The Appellant references what they describe as similar developments on a neighbouring road, but no details of those cases are before me. I am also advised that a similar extension could be constructed using Permitted Development legislation but given that such provisions do not apply to flats, I do not attach significant weight to that consideration. I note that the effects of the proposal on neighbouring living conditions is not in dispute between the parties, but I do not consider the absence of objections to be a compelling indicator of a high quality of design.
9. For the reasons that I have described, the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area would be unacceptable, in conflict with policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document 2012, which seek amongst other requirements, to secure a high quality of design.
10. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

N Smith

INSPECTOR