



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2020

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3240651

120 Raleigh Drive, Whetstone, London N20 0XA

- 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 Mrs Reeves against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/1913HSE, dated 29 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two storey rear extension, alterations to front elevation roof to create a gable and new porch. Roof dormer in rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey rear extension, alterations to front elevation roof to create a gable and new porch, roof dormer in rear elevation, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1913HSE, dated 29 March 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PA_001 REVB dated 15/03/19 Location and Block Plan, PA_002 dated 15.03.19, Existing/proposed ground floor plans, PA_003 REVA dated 15.03.19 Existing/Proposed first floor plans, PA_004 REVB dated 15.03.19 Existing/proposed loft plan, PA_005 RevB dated 15.03.19 Existing/Proposed roof plans, PA_006 REVB dated 15.09.19 Existing/proposed rear elevation, PA_007 dated 15.09.19 Existing/proposed front elevation, PA_008 RevA dated 15.03.19 Existing/proposed side extension, PA_009 RevA dated 15.03.19 Existing/proposed side extension, PA_010 RevA 15.03.19 Existing/proposed section A-A.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 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 extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the flank windows at first floor level have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Although the scheme includes alterations and extensions to the front and back of the appeal site which comprises a detached residential property, the main difference between the parties relates to the cumulative impacts of the rear extension given its height and depth.
4. The proposed rear extension would be 2 storeys in height and include a rear roof dormer. The extension would have a depth of about 4m at ground floor level and would be stepped in with a depth of around 3.5m depth at the first floor with the dormer set within the roof plane. Adopted guidance requires that first floor rear extensions should not exceed 3m depth and be set at least 0.5m below the height of the existing ridge line of the property; the appeal proposal would be set 0.3m below the ridge line. However, the guidance allows for some interpretation of these dimensions for large properties and to account for site context.
5. The scheme would infringe the adopted guidance by reason of its depth and set down from the ridge height of the original house. Whilst the ground floor extension is across the rear of the whole of the property the first floor is set away from the boundaries. This ensures that, despite its depth it would be subordinate to the original property and would have less impact on the neighbouring properties than that which could be allowed as lawful permitted development¹. The cumulative impacts of the infringements are not sufficient to result in harm to the character of the original dwelling nor to the wider area. It is accepted by the Council that the impacts on the neighbouring properties would be limited.
6. Whilst the inclusion of the rear dormer extenuates the height of the extension, the visual impacts of this are entirely localised and would not adversely impact on the wider area. The adopted guidance acknowledges the importance of site context in its interpretation. The proposed extensions are of a scale appropriate for this detached property. When viewed from the rear garden they would not be unduly overbearing.
7. On this main issue I conclude that the appeal proposals would not be unduly bulky and visually intrusive and would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, the proposed scheme would not be contrary to policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and policy CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Residential Design Guidance SPD 2016.

Conditions

8. I have considered the list of conditions suggested by the Council in light of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I have

¹ 18/5456/192

imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition relating to matching materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. Finally, a condition requiring obscure glazing in the flank walls at first floor level of the extension is required to prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR