
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3251146

19 Ranelagh Drive, Edgware HA8 8HJ

- 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 Marius Solovastru against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/0397/RCU, dated 27 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
 - The development is a part single, part two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey side and rear extension at 19 Ranelagh Drive, Edgware HA8 8HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0397/RCU, dated 27 January 2020, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: LBA 3027R-01/LB, LBA 3027R-02/LB, LBA 3027R-03/LB, LBA 3027R-04/LB and LBA 3027R-05/LB.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision letter describes the development as retrospective. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the development had been constructed. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property at No. 19 Ranelagh Drive (No. 19) is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached properties of varied character set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. A number of the dwellings have two storey side extensions of varying styles and designs that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the dwellings.
5. The appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property including a part single, part two storey side and rear

- extension granted planning permission in 2019¹. The appeal development is for a similar scheme with a slightly larger two storey side extension that is angled to follow the side boundary with No. 17 and constructed with a hipped pitched roof stepped down below the ridge of the main house.
6. The Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD) states that side extensions should be subordinate to the main dwelling and should generally not be more than half of the width of the original house. In this case, the Council indicate that the rear portion of the side extension is more than half the width of the host property and is set back 1m from the front elevation of the main house. The extension is set-in about 1m from the side boundary and is separated from the side elevation of the adjacent property at No. 17 by a pedestrian access and high close boarded fence running between the properties. No. 19 is also stepped down below the adjacent two storey property at No. 17 due to the sloping topography of the site and the surroundings.
 7. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extensions do not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Given the site's location, the first floor side extension is only visible over short distances when passing the site. It is seen in the context of the previous extensions and alterations to the appeal property and adjacent properties and changing site levels within the immediate locality.
 8. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the first floor side extension, set back and stepped down, does not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The modest overall scale and proportions of the side extension as built, together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations ensures the development sits relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The development therefore achieves an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
 9. Consequently, I conclude that the development does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It is consistent with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM01 of Barnet's Development Management Policies Document 2012, Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and the SPD. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design that respects the local context in terms of appearance, scale and design of the scheme and responds to the overall character of the area.
 10. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have specified the approved plans as a planning condition as this is necessary to provide certainty.
 11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR

¹ 19/5463/HSE