



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3243928

141 Longland Drive, Whetstone, London, N20 8HN

- 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 and Ms Levene against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/5260/HSE, dated 27 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with new terrace area at 141 Longland Drive, Whetstone, London N20 8HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/5260/HSE, dated 27 September 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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 plans: 19012.00.100 Rev F, 19012.00.050 Rev D, 19012.00.001 Rev D and 19012.00.002 Rev C.
 - 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.
 - 4) The roof of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development on the appeal form in the formal decision above as it includes the new terrace area and is therefore a more accurate description of the development applied for.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey detached dwelling constructed from brick and render under a tiled roof. The street and locality are residential in character and predominantly consists of two storey, semi and detached dwellings of a similar form, albeit with some variety in their external appearance. I was able to observe from the rear garden that neighbouring properties had benefitted from a variety of different extensions and alterations, including substantially deep single storey flat roof extensions and outbuildings to the rear.
5. Although the property has undergone substantial alterations and extensions the development applied for is limited to the rear elevation at ground floor level. The extension would be taller than the existing single storey built form in the rear gardens of Nos. 139 and 143, which abut the side boundaries, but not overly so and the upper storey of the host property would still be evident. It would also not be as deep as those additions and would be set in from the side boundaries, whilst also retaining significant rear garden space. It would be of a proportionate scale and would not be out of keeping with the character of the host property to any unacceptable degree. Located solely to the rear and in this suburban residential context, it would not be visually incongruous and would represent an entirely appropriate standard of design.
6. For these reasons, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the area. The proposal would accord with Policies CS1 and CS5 of The Barnet Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD 2012 or the guidance within the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD 2016, insofar as they require that development, including rear extensions, is of a high standard of urban design and responds to local context and distinctive local character in order to preserve or enhance character and appearance.

Conditions

7. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. A condition is required to ensure compliance with the approved plans as this provides clarity. A condition requiring details of the external materials to match existing is also necessary, in order to protect the character and appearance of the host property and area. A condition is also necessary to restrict the use of the flat roof, to avoid harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of privacy, noise and general disturbance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the plan. Having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR