



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3254353

23 Newcombe Park, Mill Hill, London NW7 3QN

- 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 Elliot Sorsky against the decision of The London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1365/HSE, dated 11 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is Proposed single storey rear extension including internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with crown roof and 3no rooflights, at 23 Newcombe Park, Mill Hill, London NW7 3QN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/1365/HSE, dated 11 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Side elevation 05/1057/PLAN/106 dated Feb 2020, Rear elevation 05/1057/PLAN/105 dated Feb 2020, Proposed Roof plans 05/1057/PLAN/104 dated Feb 2020, Proposed Ground Floorplans 05/1057/PLAN/103 dated Feb 2020, Existing Floorplans 05/1057/PLAN/102 dated Feb 2020, Existing Site and Location Plan 05/1057/PLAN/101 dated Feb 2020.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been amended by the Council and described as a 'Single storey rear extension with crown roof and 3no rooflights'. I find this description to accurately reflect the development before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a substantial detached dwelling with a large rear garden. Whilst it has previously been extended at the side and rear, these additions are in keeping with the character of the host dwelling and are subordinate in scale. The street scene along Newcombe Park comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings with varied façade designs but maintains a consistent character of large residential dwellings.
5. The extension to the rear would effectively infill the majority of the patio area from the existing playroom extension across most of the rear of the property. Given the projection of the existing single storey extension, it would create a more 'complete' appearance to the rear elevation. The use of matching materials and harmonising design would ensure the proposal appears subordinate to the host dwelling.
6. Despite the additional extensions to the property and the advice contained within the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SBD), I find that the proposed extension would achieve a cohesive appearance with the host dwelling, and as a whole remain consistent with the overall character and appearance along Newcombe Park. On this basis, no harm would arise to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
7. It therefore complies with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (BLP) Development Management Policies (adopted September 2012), and the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (adopted October 2016). Collectively these policies and the SPD seek, amongst other things, to ensure development respects the character and appearance of buildings and the surrounding area.

Conditions

8. The appeal is allowed subject to the standard three year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. The proposed materials are listed on the plans and negates the need to apply a condition. These conditions comply with advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR