
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3246420
32 Green Lane, Edgware HA8 7PR

- 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 Mrs Naomi Yeshua against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/5710/HSE, dated 21 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The plan submitted shows only a limited depiction of the form that the proposed development would take. In particular, there are no plans which demonstrate how the proposed extension would interface with the existing pitched roof of the garage to which it would join. Whilst there is reference to the matter in the appellant's appeal statement, this does not provide adequate confirmation as to what is proposed. Although the development would take place towards the rear of the property, the garage is visible from Green Lane and also from adjoining dwellings.
4. Consequently, I cannot be sure based on the information that I do have, and my own observations during my site visit, as to how much of the garage roof would be retained and what the final appearance of the proposed development would be. There is also an absence of information as to the extent of other aspects of the proposal, including there being no details of the appearance of the rear elevation or the intended height of all of the development. Overall, insufficient details have been provided to allow me to conclude whether or not there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the proposed development.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to an extant planning permission (19/0931/HSE), however that development stops at the frontmost point of the garage and would seemingly not have a comparable impact upon its existing pitched roof structure. It therefore does not offer any support for allowing the

proposed development that is the subject of this appeal in the context I have described.

6. The projection of the extension beyond the existing built form of both the appeal dwelling and the adjoining dwelling would be relatively limited. It would therefore not in itself represent an overdevelopment of the site in terms of having a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area, even on consideration of the extensions that have already been made to the appeal dwelling. However, my finding on this matter does not overcome the substantive matters I have identified above, in particular that related to the interface of the proposed development with the roof of the existing garage.
7. For these reasons, I cannot be certain that the proposal as a whole would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a result, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would accord with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies 2012 where they seek to safeguard character and appearance, and with the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 where it seeks to achieve the same aims. This being the case, the appeal must fail.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR