



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3239062

14 Fakenham Close, Mill Hill, London NW7 2SD

- 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 D Freedman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/4031/HSE, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed first floor rear extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed first floor extension at 14 Fakenham Close, Mill Hill, London NW7 2SD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/4031/HSE, dated 22 July 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 Nos. 01/LB; 02/LB Rev A; 03/LB Rev A; 04/LB.
 - 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 Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The surrounding area is primarily characterised by residential properties of modern construction mainly built from brick and tiled materials. The properties in the area are mainly of two storey scale with the appeal property being part of a cluster of four dwellings.
4. The proposed extension would be set back from the site boundary and have a ridge line stepped down from the existing ridge line, and would therefore appear sensitive in design and scale to the host property and surrounding buildings. It is noted that there aren't any nearby properties with similar first floor extensions, nevertheless the proposal would be sympathetic in massing and siting, and would not appear as an incongruous feature.

5. The appeal property has had a number of alterations at ground floor which disrupts the symmetry and uniformity of the group of four properties. The proposed first floor extension is located to the rear and would be predominantly screened from the front street scene by existing buildings. The proposal, due to its positioning, design and scale would not have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the surrounding properties or the character of the wider area.
6. The proposal would not be a discordant structure and would not harm the character of the surrounding area. The proposal would be in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM01 of the Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 which seeks development to be of high quality design, create a quality environment and protect and enhance character.

Conditions

7. 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

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

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR