

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2020

**by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 22 September 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3247246**

**8 Aldridge Avenue, The Hale, Edgware HA8 8TA**

- 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 Harry Harris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 19/6517/HSE, dated 4 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as 'Part Single, part two storey rear extension'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of the front porch. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to the part single/part two storey rear extension in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/6517/HSE, dated 4 December 2019, and the plans with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 1910 P1C - Proposed Ground Floor Plan (received 23.01.20) 1910 P2A - Proposed First Floor Plan (received 04.12.19) 1910 P3 - Proposed Roof Plans (received 04.12.19) 1910 P4C - Proposed Plans and Elevations (received 04.12.19) 1910 P5A - Proposed Site and Location Plans (received 04.12.19).
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Procedural Matters

2. For clarity, I have included 'Harry' in the name of the appellant in the banner heading as it is listed on the appeal form.
3. For the reasons that follow, I find the element of the scheme for the erection of a part single/part two storey rear extension to be acceptable and it is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the element of the scheme for the erection of a front porch. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the part single/part two storey rear extension.

## **Main Issue**

4. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

## **Reasons**

5. The host dwelling is a semi-detached dwelling located on a residential cul-de-sac, which predominantly comprises of semi-detached houses varying in design and appearance. The proposed development seeks permission for the erection of a part single/part 2-storey rear extension and a front porch. It is common ground between the main parties that the element of the scheme involving the 2-storey rear extension is not in dispute and that the proposed development does not raise any issues surrounding living conditions. On the basis of the evidence before me, I have little reason to disagree with the main parties on these issues.
6. A number of properties on Aldridge Road have been brought to my attention by the appellant in his statement, which have front porches. Whilst noting these properties, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the particular planning backgrounds to those schemes. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between those developments and the case before me cannot be drawn except insofar as I was able to observe and assess the sites at my visit.
7. In any event, whilst there are a number of front porches on properties in the locality of the site, I find that the scheme before me has notable differences in design and appearance. Whilst I find some merit in separating the proposed porch from the existing bay window, the proposed development would form a strident addition to the front of the host dwelling. I do not necessarily consider that the footprint of the proposed porch would be excessive. However, I find that the monopitch roof, in particular its height, size and location close the existing cill level at first floor to be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling, that would in turn harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. For all of these reasons, I conclude that the erection of the proposed front porch would significantly harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy DM01, DM02 of the Council's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012 (DMP), Policy CS5 of the Council's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document 2012 (CS), the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 (SPD) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
9. The single storey rear extension would extend approximately 2.3m from the existing rear elevation and would wrap around the detached store and 'square off' the chamfered elevation of the existing ground floor rear extension. The appellant has brought to my attention an appeal decision<sup>1</sup>, which I have had regard to in the determination of this appeal. The SPD states the depth of a

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/N5090/D/18/3212090

single storey rear extension, normally considered acceptable for semi-detached properties is 3.5 metres.

10. Given the proposal would be situated off an existing extension, I find the proposed development is in excess of the advice contained within the SPD. However, the SPD lists a number of criteria<sup>2</sup> which single storey rear extensions to the original house would need to ensure. I consider the proposed single storey rear extension complies with the listed criteria. Furthermore, the proposed single storey extension is unlikely to be clearly visible from the road or areas of public realm in the surrounding area due to the presence and layout of the host dwelling and its neighbours, particularly No 9 Aldridge Avenue.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposed single storey rear extension would be relatively modest in scale, proportionate and complementary to the host property. Whilst it may wrap around the detached store, the proposed development would not constitute an awkward feature or overdevelopment of the site, nor would it result in any adverse effects on neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, the proposed single storey rear extension complies with the overall design objectives of the SPD.
12. For all of these reasons, I conclude that the erection of the part single/part two storey rear extension would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. Consequently, it would accord with the design, character and appearance aims of DMP Policies DM01, DM02, CS Policy CS5, the SPD, the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document 2016 and the requirements of the Framework.

### **Other Matter**

13. I have noted the comments from the appellant about the way the Council handled the application, but this does not affect the planning merits of the case. I have considered this appeal on its own merits and concluded that the proposed front porch would be unacceptable and the part single/part two storey rear extension would be acceptable for the reasons set out above.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above and taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the element of the scheme for the erection of the part single/part two storey rear extension and dismissed insofar as it relates to the element of the scheme for the erection of a front porch.

*W Johnson*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> 14.22 of the SPD