



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3237283
29 Clifford Road, Barnet EN5 5PD

- 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 H Yavari against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/1889/HSE, dated 29 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has submitted plans for a first floor extension with an alternative design. The Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals - England advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. I have therefore made my decision on the plans originally consulted upon and considered by the Council.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a substantial turn of the Century detached two-storey house located on Clifford Road. The area is residential in nature comprising of older and more modern housing, including low rise flats. The appeal site has been extended by virtue of a full width single storey flat roofed rear extension at approximately 8m long projection. It is above part of this extension that the appellant seeks to erect a first floor, the full width of the property with an approximate projection of 4m from the rear wall of the host dwelling.
5. The current single storey extension appears disproportionately large to the appeal dwelling and the appellant considers that the design of the development and use of matching materials would result in a more proportionate and harmonising development.
6. The Council's Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Residential Design Guidance (2016) is clear in its guidance that two storey rear extensions

that are closer than 2 metres to a neighbouring boundary and project more than 3 metres in depth, are not normally considered acceptable. I acknowledge the SPD does allow for more flexibility in respect of two storey extensions on widely spaced detached houses.

7. Nevertheless, it is the combination of the existing ground floor flat roofed extension with a proposed large first floor flat roofed element, together with the insertion of arched windows to the rear elevation that would not respect the fenestration detail of the host dwelling, that would altogether appear as an unsympathetic and disjointed extension. It would not restore the balance, but would instead appear as a bulky and incongruous addition that fails to harmonise with the original building, despite the use of matching materials.
8. As the proposal would not respond positively to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and as it would be seen in gaps between the flats of Orchard Court and 31/33 Clifford Road, it would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area.
9. The appellant compares the proposed development to the dwellings of 35 and 37 Clifford Road as there is a long rear extension to these dwellings. However, this is not comparable to the appeal site as it is a different house type with a different roof form above the projection. Furthermore, I am not aware of its planning circumstances.
10. Despite the fact there are other extensions within the area, and flat roofs are in evidence, together with the improved living conditions the proposed development would afford its occupiers, I am not persuaded that these factors outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. Therefore, having considered the proposal, the development would be contrary to Policies DM01 of the Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (DPD) and Policy CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) DPD (2012). These policies aim to ensure development respects local context and character, and is of high-quality design, amongst other matters. Finally, I consider the proposal would conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard to the objections received to the proposal from nearby residential occupiers. The separation distance between the proposed development and the objectors' properties would be sufficient so as not to cause a loss of privacy or light reduction. The proposed extension would also not result in reduced living conditions to other local residents due to the relationship of the proposed extension with other dwellings.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR