The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3235020
41 Armitage Road, London NW11 8QT

- 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 & Mrs R Kashi against the decision of Barnet London Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/3148/HSE, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2019.
- The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large detached residential dwelling located on the southern side of Armitage Road. The area is characterised by a uniform pattern of large dwellings, occupying the predominant width of their residential plots, and generous rear garden areas. The host dwelling is subject to a number of existing extensions, including a ground floor rear extension, a large rear facing dormer, and a dormer extension located on each side of the roof plane facing adjoining neighbouring properties.

4. The existing extensions maintain a subordinate relationship to the host dwelling by preserving the original building form at the first floor level to the rear. The proposed first floor rear extension would obscure this extent and combine with the existing extensions to overwhelm the original form of the host dwelling. The cumulative bulk of these extensions would appear disproportionate to the host dwelling and cramped, with the proposal conflicting with the extent of the existing dormer on the rear facing roof plane.

5. Whilst I observed varied types of rear extensions to dwellings on adjoining properties, I did not observe any examples which were as numerous or disproportionate as the appeal proposal would be. Although the rear extension would not be visible from the street scene this would not outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding pattern of development.

6. Reference has been made to a first floor rear extension permitted at 48 Armitage Road, opposite the appeal site (LPA Ref 14/07364/HSE). Whilst similar in design, I am not satisfied that this example is directly comparable to the appeal proposal based on the details submitted. The rear elevation of No 48 had only been extended at the ground floor level and maintained the original roof form, whilst the appeal property has been extended at both the ground floor level and within the roof plane. Notwithstanding this, I have decided the appeal before me based on the information provided.

7. I note also the suggested fallback position under permitted development rights. No substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this would likely occur. Be that as it may, in my view any such extension would not be as cumulatively substantial as the proposal before me.

8. Accordingly, the proposed first floor rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies (adopted September 2012), Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (adopted March 2015), and the Barnet Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (adopted October 2016) (SPD). These policies and SPD collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure development respects the character and appearance of buildings and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR