

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3252343
66 Raleigh Drive, Whetstone, London N20 0XA

- 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 A Halim against the decision of Barnet London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0429/HSE, dated 27 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is for demolition of existing rear conservatory. New single storey rear extension, first floor single storey rear and side extension with extended roof and rear dormer including roof windows. Conversion of garage into habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 68 Raleigh Drive, with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two storey house within a residential area whereby houses have been altered and extended in a multitude of ways. There exists an attached flat roof single storey garage adjacent to the boundary shared with 68 Raleigh Drive, with a narrow path intervening. No 68 has already been extended to its side at first floor level.
4. Notwithstanding the fact that the whole proposal would be built within the appeal site, along the existing line of construction from the ground floor up, the existing gap at first floor level would not be maintained, thereby reducing the sense of spaciousness between the two neighbouring properties.
5. I note the examples where houses have been extended next to each other, and whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these or otherwise, each case must be assessed on its own merits. I accept that the proposal would not create a terrace per se, due to the aforementioned pathway maintaining separation between nos 66 and 68, albeit slight.

6. It has not been explained what the Officer's proposed amendments to the design were or how they would be contrary to design policies. Nevertheless with regard to the plans before me, whilst the side extension would keep the existing long rectangular front elevation, it would reduce the visual gap between nos 66 and 68 thereby giving rise to a cramped appearance within the street scene.
7. In combination with the proposed rear dormer extension to the roof, which would fail to sympathise with the original architecture of the host dwelling, I find that by reason of its overall scale, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore find that it would be contrary to policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document September 2012 (CS) and Criteria a. and b. of policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document September 2012 (DMP), as well as policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan March 2016. Together these policies seek to ensure that development in Barnet respects local context and character, creating places of high quality design, whilst having regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets. I also find the proposal contrary to the Council's Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance October 2016 (SPD) which, amongst other things, requires extensions to normally be subordinate to the original house and not be overly dominant.

Living Conditions

8. The rear element of the two storey side extension would project 2.8 metres which would comply with the SPD. Further, approximately half of that would actually be in front of the rear elevation of no 68 and therefore approximately only half of the rear extension would extend adjacent to shared rear garden boundary. I acknowledge that the extension would be in relatively close proximity to the neighbouring property, however by virtue of its limited depth it would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing when viewed from no 68's garden. Therefore I consider that the proposal would not give rise to a material loss of outlook for the occupants of no 68, and in this respect the proposal would comply with criterion e. of DMP policy DM01.
9. Notwithstanding this, and having sympathy with the appellant's need to provide for their expanding family, the proposal would not preserve the scale and integrity of the existing house with extensions failing to be subordinate in their appearance; and which would have harmful impact upon the visual amenities of the street scene.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR