



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

Decision date: 08 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3260816

4 Glebe Road, Finchley, London, N3 2AX

- 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 Tagbo Umenyilora against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/2504/HSE, dated 4 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, first and second floor extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. 4 Glebe Road is a two storey end of terrace house. It is occupied under licence as a HMO although I understand that planning permission has not been given for this use. In common with all the other properties in the terrace to the west it has a two storey outrigger with a pitched roof. It differs from the others in that the neighbouring property immediately to the east, Connections House, is a three storey block of flats of a different style of construction, so the pitched roof at No. 4 appears as a monopitch rather than being part of a matching pair. There is a further single storey rear extension adjacent to the eastern boundary.
4. I consider that the relevant policies in this case include DM01 and DM02 of the Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) (the *DPD*), CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (2012) (the *Core Strategy*), 7.4, and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) (the *London Plan*) and Barnet's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guidance* (the *SPD*). These seek to ensure, among other things, that development should be of a high quality design which minimises the impact on the local environment, respects the form, scale and architectural style of the existing buildings and does not harm residential amenity.

Character and appearance

5. The proposed flat roofed ground floor extension would fill in the existing narrow space between the existing side wall of the outrigger and the common boundary with No.6. The proposal would involve a minor extension towards the boundary with Connections House at first floor level and a full height extension at second floor level, replacing the monopitch roof with a flat roof and set away from the boundary with No. 6 by approximately 1.7m in line with the existing ground and first floor outrigger.
6. The levels across the site are such that the two storey extension would appear slightly set down from the main roof level. Notwithstanding this, I consider that the cumulative effect of the extensions would result in an excessively bulky and incongruous addition to the building which would out of keeping with the character of the rest of the terrace to the west, particularly in respect of the second floor flat roof. The proposal would not respect the appearance, scale and pattern of the existing building or the terrace as a whole.
7. I accept that Connections House to the east is of a larger scale and design. However, this is a more recent purpose-built property clearly separate from the traditional pattern of development of regular pitched roof outriggers along the terrace.
8. I conclude that the proposed extensions would harm the character and appearance of the house itself and the surrounding area, contrary to policies DM01 of the DPD, CS5 of the Core Strategy, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and the SPD.

Living conditions

9. The proposed single storey extension would infill the space between the existing side wall of the outrigger and the boundary with No. 6. The corresponding space along the side at No. 6 is approximately 1.7m wide. There are rear facing glazed doors and two large side facing windows in No. 6 from which there would be a significant loss of outlook and light due to the proximity and height of the proposed side wall.
10. I have taken account of the orientation of the rear of the property towards the south and the consequent incidence of sunlight reaching the windows at No.6. I consider that the proposed ground floor side wall would create a long tunnel effect which would reduce the amount of available sun and daylight at most times of the year. It would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure in the outlook from the ground floor windows of No. 6. I accept that at the time of my visit there was a high fence along the boundary. However, the extension would be higher and more obtrusive.
11. The proposed second floor extension would result in a vertical wall approximately 1.7m from the common boundary. I consider that its close proximity to the rear facing first floor window and side facing windows of No.6 would increase the sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from those windows to the detriment of the occupiers.
12. I acknowledge that in a closely built up area such as this a certain degree of overlooking and limited privacy is to be expected. There are existing side facing windows at first floor level in Nos. 4 and 6 which appear to serve bathrooms. The provision of obscure glazing maintains the degree of mutual

overlooking between these windows at an acceptable level. I consider that the provision of additional side facing windows at second floor level, even with obscure glazing, would increase the perception of overlooking and loss of privacy, particularly from that serving the proposed living room. Although this would not necessarily be sufficient on its own to warrant dismissing the appeal, it adds weight to my overall concerns regarding the proposal.

13. I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 6 by reason of an increase in the sense of enclosure and loss of outlook and privacy, contrary to policies DM01 and DM02 of the DPD, CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy, 7.6 of the London Plan and the SPD.
14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR