



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/20/3252566

3 Hillview Road, Mill Hill, London NW7 1AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr T Hardy against the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/0351/FUL, is dated 22 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion of the existing single family dwellinghouse into two self-contained houses including single storey rear extension. New side access door to No 4. Associated amenity space, refuse and cycle storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal provides an appropriate mix of housing.

Reasons

3. Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community.
4. Policy CS3 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and Policy DM08 of the Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 (DMP) seek to distribute growth to meet housing aspirations and have development provide an appropriate mix of housing. Policy DM08 sets out the Authority's priorities in terms of type and size of dwellings indicating that for market housing, homes with 4 bedrooms are the highest priority with 3 bedrooms being medium priority.
5. The proposal for one bedroom housing, would not fall into the highest or medium priority level. The proposal would therefore not provide medium or high priority homes which would provide choice for a growing and diverse population in the area.
6. The appellant states that communities should not be dominated by single accommodation type and housing should meet the needs of different groups of people. There is evidently a lack of 3 and 4 bedroom properties given these are identified as higher and medium priority for housing deliverance. The proposal would not deliver these types of housing and would actually result in a deficiency of a 3 bedroom property, therefore not meeting the needs of different groups of people in the area.

7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not provide an appropriate mix of housing and would conflict with Policy CS3 of the CS and Policy DM08 of the DMP.
8. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case and other developments in the area including schemes at Millbrook Park and Ridgeway View. However, insufficient information has been provided on these schemes and therefore cannot be sure that they are directly comparable to the appeal scheme, particularly with regards to location and specific mix of housing. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

Other matters

9. The proposal would make a small contribution to the supply of housing and would provide adequate residential accommodation for future occupiers whilst not compromising the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The character and appearance of the surrounding area, trees in the area and highway safety would not be adversely compromised. Sufficient refuse storage would also be provided. These benefits and matters do not outweigh the harm identified in the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR