

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

**by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11 January 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3260561**

**18 The Grove, Edgware HA8 9QB**

- 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 J Hyman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 20/1307/HSE, dated 9 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
  - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing extension at 18 The Grove, Edgware HA8 9QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1307/HSE, dated 9 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: No. 30/P/2 and No. 30/P/1 Rev B.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

## Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed single storey side and rear extension on:
  - (i) the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and
  - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at Nos. 16 and 20 The Grove with particular regard to light, overshadowing and outlook.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a garage attached to the side and a single storey flat roofed extension at the rear. It is located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway.
5. I observed on my site visit that a number of the nearby dwellings have single storey side and rear extensions of varying styles and designs that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the dwellings. The rear of the appeal property is dominated by a large single storey flat roofed extension projecting approximately 5.7 m from the rear and partially across the width of the house. As a result the original rhythm and harmony of the rear elevation of the property has been significantly eroded.
6. The proposal would entail the demolition of the existing rear extension and the construction of a single storey side and rear extension with a shallow pitched roof. The proposed rear extension would extend across the full width of the extended house in a staggered form and would project out overall by about 5.7m from the rear elevation of the property.
7. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Given the site's location, the proposed extension would only be visible over short distances when passing the site. It would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles of the existing extensions and alterations at the appeal property and the surrounding properties.
8. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed side and rear extension would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property. The modest overall scale and proportions of the extension, together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet's Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM01 of Barnet's Development Management Policies Document 2012 (DMP) and the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD). These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design that respects the local context in terms of appearance, scale and design of the development and responds to the overall character of the area.

### *Living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties*

10. The proposed extension would be located adjacent to the two storey properties at Nos. 16 and 20 The Grove (Nos. 16 and 20). The proposed side extension would be set back from the common shared side boundary with the adjacent

detached property at No. 16, to the south of the site. The adjacent property at No. 16 has a single storey garage attached at the side and is set back and separated from the appeal site by a high close boarded fence and mature vegetation running between the properties.

11. The adjoining unextended semi-detached property at No. 20, to the north of the appeal site, has a small paved area leading out to an enclosed garden area at the rear. The proposed rear extension would be inset from and project about 3.0m along the common shared boundary with No. 20 and would be separated from the rooms and garden at the rear of the adjacent property by a high close boarded fence running between the properties.
12. Whilst I accept that there would be some impact from the development, given the overall height and design of the extension, set in, together with the boundary treatment, the separation distance between the properties and the orientation of the buildings, I consider that the rear extension would not result in significant loss of light and overshadowing of the main habitable rooms and gardens at the rear of Nos. 16 and 20.
13. Given the proposed design and layout of the development and the separation distance between the properties, I consider that the proposed side and rear extension, set back, would not significantly dominate the views to cause an overbearing effect and an unacceptable sense of enclosure at the rear of Nos. 16 and 20. The outlook at the rear of Nos. 16 and 20 is already toward the boundary fence and the blank side elevation of the existing single storey rear extension at No. 18 and the appeal site would be separated by the existing garden area at the rear of Nos. 16 and 20.
14. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at Nos. 16 and 20 The Grove with particular regard to light, overshadowing and outlook. It would be consistent with Policy DM01 of the DMP and the SPD. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that all development proposals including extensions and alterations provide the highest standards of design and allow for adequate daylight, sunlight and outlook for adjoining and potential occupiers.

### **Conditions**

15. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition requiring matching external materials.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*David Troy*

INSPECTOR