



---

# 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: 08 November 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3235661**  
**12 Grenville Place, Mill Hill, London NW7 3SF**

- 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 Janaki Marina Fonseka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 19/2123/HSE, dated 10 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2019.
  - The development proposed is described as "Proposed two storey rear extension."
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed two storey rear extension at 12 Grenville Place, Mill Hill, London NW7 3SF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2123/HSE, dated 10 April 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 plan: Drawing No. 12GP/P01.
  - 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.

## Main Issues

2. 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 11 Grenville Place (No 11) with regards to light and outlook.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. The area is characterised by modern residential properties of mainly brick and tiled construction. The properties in the area are mostly two storey dwellings with the appeal property being part of a row of two storey houses.
4. The proposed two storey extension would be sympathetic in design and scale with the ridge line stepped down from the existing ridge line of the main roof. Whilst none of the nearby properties have two storey rear extensions, the proposed development would be sensitive in terms of massing and scale, and

would not appear as a bulky structure. The proposed extension would be predominantly screened from the front street scene by the existing buildings and would not have a detrimental effect on the character of the wider area.

5. The proposal would not be an incongruous feature and would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The proposal would be in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 (DMP), Policy CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (CS), Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (LP) and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 (RDG) which seeks development to be of high quality design, create a quality environment and protect and enhance character.

#### *Living conditions*

6. The windows and doors in the rear elevation of No 11 are not close to the boundary with the appeal property. The proposed extension, being of approximately 2 metres in depth, would be of a modest scale. Given the scale of the proposal and the distance from the windows and doors of No 11, there would be no adverse overbearing effects created that would compromise the outlook of the occupiers of No 11.
7. Due to the scale and siting of the proposed development and the orientation of the existing buildings, the proposed development would not be bulky and would not create any overshadowing that would have detrimental effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11.
8. I therefore find that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11 with regards to light and outlook. The proposal would accord with Policies DM01 and DM02 of the DMP, Policies CS1 and CS5 of the CS, Policy 7.6 of the LP, the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, the RDG and the 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**

9. 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**

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

*Chris Baxter*

INSPECTOR