



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3232843

23 Newcombe Park, Mill Hill, London NW7 3QN

- 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 Elliot Sorsky against the decision of Barnet London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/2327/HSE, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension, including internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension, including internal alterations, at 23 Newcombe Park, Mill Hill, London NW7 3QN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2327/HSE, dated 18 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Proposed Site Plan and Existing Block Plan (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/101, Rev A, dated 25.03.2019); Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/102, Rev A, dated 25.03.2019); Existing First Floor Plan (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/103, dated Jan.2019); Existing West and East Elevations (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/104, dated 08/07); Existing Front and Rear Elevations (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/105, dated Aug 05); Proposed First Floor Plan (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/106, Rev B, dated 25.03.2019); Proposed Roof Plan (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/107, Rev A, dated 25.03.2019); Existing Roof Plan (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/108, dated Jan.19); Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/109, Rev A, dated 25.03.2019); Proposed Front and Rear Elevations (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/110, Rev A, dated 25.03.2019); Proposed West and East Elevations (Dwg No 05/1026/PLAN/111, Rev A, dated 25.03.2019).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with a large rear garden. Whilst it has previously been extended at the side and rear, these additions are in keeping with the character of the host dwelling and are subordinate in scale. The street scene along Newcombe Park comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings with varied façade designs, but maintains a consistent character of large residential dwellings occupying the majority of their respective plot width.
4. The proposed first floor side extension would achieve a sympathetic relationship with the host dwelling by replicating the existing roof design. It would also maintain the subordinate appearance established by the existing ground floor side extension by having a lower height than the host dwelling and being setback well behind the building line. The proposed extension would therefore achieve a cohesive appearance with the host dwelling and as a whole remain consistent with the overall character and appearance along Newcombe Park.
5. Accordingly, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (BLP) Development Management Policies (adopted September 2012), Policies CS1 and CS5 of the BLP Core Strategy (adopted September 2012) and the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted October 2016). Collectively these policies and the SPD seek, amongst other things, to ensure development respects the character and appearance of buildings and the surrounding area.

Conditions

6. The appeal is allowed subject to the standard three year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. The Council recommended a condition requiring the external surfaces of the development to match the existing building. However, in this instance I do not consider such a condition to be necessary as sufficient detail has been provided on the plans. These conditions comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR