



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2020

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3256737

63 Arlington Road, Southgate, London, N14 5BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A4 of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Telis Alexandrou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/1736/PNH, dated 6 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is 3m single storey rear extension – see attached drawings PD1910-01,02,03,04.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises - taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made in the same manner.

Reasons

3. Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) and policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2012) (the DPD) require development to be of a high quality of design which creates an attractive environment in which people can live, with adequate amenities including light and outlook.
4. The Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guidance* advises that rear extensions should not cause a loss of outlook or light to principal windows in habitable rooms of neighbouring properties.
5. The proposed single storey extension, including the existing rear extension, would project approximately 6 metres in total from the main rear wall of the house and across its full width. It would be sited immediately adjacent to the boundary with No. 61 and would project approximately 3 metres beyond the rear wall of the existing single storey extension at the latter.

6. The land slopes downward from the rear of the two houses towards the end of the rear garden so that the side wall of the proposed extension would appear particularly high when viewed from No. 61. At the time of my visit, there was a high fence along the boundary between the two properties which casts shade and provides some privacy.
7. I consider that the proposed extension would be significantly higher than the fence and would appear overbearing in the outlook from the rear patio doors and the garden of No. 61. There would be also some loss of sunlight at certain times of the day although this would not be sufficient on its own to warrant dismissing the appeal.
8. I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of the occupiers of No. 61 by reason of its siting, height and rearward projection, contrary to policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy, DM01 of the DPD and the SPD.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR