
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/19/3240210

Flat 27b and Flat 27c Hampden Way, Southgate, London N14 5DJ

- 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 Simon Harkos against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/3583/FUL, dated 27 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as first and second floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a three-storey detached building that is divided into a four separate flats. To the north, the property is bounded by a single storey nursery school, to the south and west there is a Hampden Way, a predominantly residential street of two- storey properties and to the east there is a rear access lane with two-storey residential properties beyond. Due to its scale and position the host property is prominent in the street scene although I note the presence of other three storey buildings of similar scale, north of the appeal site, beyond the nursery school, where Hampden Way meets Osidge Lane.
4. The appeal property has previously been extended and to the rear there is a full height extension across the full width of the property, in addition, there is a ground floor extension and roof terrace which leads down into the rear parking area via an external staircase.
5. The proposal seeks to introduce a further extension to the first and second floors that would sit on top of the existing ground floor extension and rise to the eaves height of the existing extension. The proposed extension would project around 3.1metres along the shared boundary with no 25 Hampden Way but set away from the boundary with the nursery school by approximately 1metre.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide (SPD) 2016 requires that extensions are subordinate to the original house, respect the original building and should not be overly dominant. The height of the extension should also be lower than the original building.
7. I note that the appellant has amended the proposal to attempt to create proposal that would appear subordinate to the host property and in doing so has reduced the height and width of the proposed extension. Nevertheless, I consider that due to the projection and height of the proposal, the scale and bulk of the extension would appear dominant and incongruous, particularly as it would be positioned on such a prominent building. In this regard, I find that it would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of host property and the wider area.
8. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the SPD, Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan, Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 (DMP) which, amongst other things require development proposals to be of high quality design that preserves or enhances local character and respects the context of the area in terms of scale, height and pattern of surrounding buildings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has brought to my attention other rear extensions within the local area which I was able to view whilst conducting my site visit. Whilst I do not have the precise details of these developments or the circumstances under which they were granted planning permission, I noted that none of the examples provided were directly comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of height and scale. Nevertheless, I must determine this appeal on its own merits and the presence of other extensions in the locality does not alter my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR