



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2019

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3235982

25 Dalmeny Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1DE

- 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 Dr and Mrs Edmund and Delphine Garr against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/3555/HSE, dated 26 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear conservatory at 25 Dalmeny Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1DE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/3555/HSE, dated 26 June 2019, 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/Block Plan; Location Plan; Existing Elevations; Existing Plan; Proposed Elevations; Proposed Plan.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. For the sake of brevity and clarity I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area; and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Dalmeny Road (No 27) in respect of light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by residential properties of traditional architectural detailing. The appeal property has an existing rear extension and there are variant styles of rear extensions within the surrounding area. It is this mix of different built forms that contribute to the character of the immediate area.

5. The proposed extension would be modest in size and would not dominate the appeal property. Due to the design and scale of the proposed extension it would appear subordinate to the existing property and not be an intrusive feature within the surrounding area.
6. The proposed development including the existing extensions would create an overall depth of about 6.6 metres. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 (RDG) recommends that rear extensions should extend 3.5 metres for semi-detached properties. However, the RDG also states that rear extensions need to ensure they do not look too bulky and prominent. Given the small scale nature of the proposed extension and the sensitive design, it would not have an overbearing effect on the appeal building and would not appear bulky or overly prominent.
7. The proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area. The proposal would accord with Policy DM01 of the Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 (DMP), Policies CSNPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and the RDG which seeks development to be of high quality design, create a quality environment and protect and enhance character.

Living conditions

8. The proposed extension would be of a modest scale and including the existing rear extensions, they would not appear as bulky structures when viewed from the property of No 27. The depth and height of the extension would be sympathetic in size and would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 in respect of outlook.
9. Due to the size, height and positioning of the proposed extension and the orientation of the existing buildings, the proposal would not result in any significant loss of light and the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 will not be detrimentally affected.
10. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 with regards to light and outlook. The proposal would not be contrary to Policies DM01 and DM02 of the DMP, the RDG and Supplementary Planning Document: Sustainable Design and Construction 2016 which seeks development to be designed to allow for adequate light and outlook for adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to materials in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR