



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3248978

7 Wardell Close, Mill Hill, London NW7 2LG

- 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 B Jafari against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/6093/HSE, dated 12 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the "replacement of the gable roof of approved two storey side extension (17/0673/HSE) with a pitched roof (retrospective)".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of the gable roof of approved two storey side extension (17/0673/HSE) with a pitched roof (retrospective) at 7 Wardell Close, Mill Hill, London NW7 2LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/6093/HSE, dated 12 November 2019, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 201911/7WC/RC/S1 (Location Plan), 201911/7WC/RC/01 Rev A (Proposed Plans) and 201911/7WC/RC/02 Rev A (Proposed Elevations).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms a two storey end of terrace property that is constructed of brick under a tiled roof. The site lies within a residential estate which contains a variety of style and size of properties. The Council confirm that the appeal site benefits from an extant planning permission¹ to erect a two storey side extension on the property. The roof that was proposed as part of the extant permission was hipped and is therefore different to the one that has subsequently been constructed at the site.
4. Although the address of the appeal site is Wardell Close, given the layout of the estate, the extension is most prominent when viewed from Field Mead. While I accept that there are other styles of roof in the vicinity, such as those on the flatted development at Clayton Field, the roof that has been constructed at the

¹ 17/0673/HSE dated 13 April 2017

site is nonetheless in keeping with the prevailing character of dwellings that exist in the area. Thus, I do not consider this particular element harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area or the host property.

5. Furthermore, notwithstanding the increase in the overall width of the extension when considered against that refused as part of application 16/1141/HSE, the two storey extension has been set down from the ridge of the main dwelling and has also been set back from its principal elevation at first floor level. Thus, I am satisfied that, in this particular case, the overall design, size, scale and bulk of the extension represents a sufficiently subordinate and sympathetic addition to the dwelling, which in turn does not have a significant negative effect on the character and appearance of the area or the host property.
6. I acknowledge that the development is not in compliance with the guidance as set out within the London Borough of Barnet Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2016. However, I find that it is nonetheless in compliance with adopted development plan policies which seek amongst other things, to ensure that developments create high quality places that respect local context, distinctive local character and the appearance, scale and pattern of surrounding buildings to protect Barnet's character.
7. Thus, the development would not be in conflict with Policy DM01 of the London Borough of Barnet Development Management Policies DPD 2012, Policies CS1 and CS5 of the London Borough of Barnet Core Strategy DPD 2012 and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, the requirements of which are specified above.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that I have considered in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. As the development has been started there is no requirement for the standard time condition. In addition, as the materials of the extension match the existing building, there is also no requirement for a condition to control such matters. However, the approved plans should be specified to provide certainty.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR