



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2020

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12/01/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3249069

22 Woolmead Avenue, London, NW9 7AY

- 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 Manji Lalji Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/6772/HSE, dated 23 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 22 Woolmead Avenue, London, NW9 7AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1772/HSE, dated 23 December 2019, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 22WmA01/19/13; 22WmA01/19/07; 22WmA01/19/04; 22WmA01/19/09; 22WmA01/19/10; 22WmA01/19/08; 22WmA01/19/11; 22WmA01/19/12.
 - 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.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.
3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, probably built in the 1930's and typical of many of that period, with a main block with a hipped roof and bay windows below a projecting gable to the front elevation. Surrounding dwellings are mostly of a similar age and style. Whilst gaps between many of the dwellings are small, those on corner plots are more spacious despite many of those having two storey side extensions. These features give the area its suburban character which the Council's Residential Design Guidance seeks to maintain.

4. The appeal dwelling has previously been extended with a ground floor side extension up to the side boundary with an electricity substation which separates the dwelling from its nearest neighbour at no 18. That extension is set back from the front wall of the dwelling and has a small, somewhat incongruous pitched roof on its front elevation. On its rear elevation it projects slightly to the rear and has a flat roof.
5. The proposed first floor extension would extend over the existing extension and would have a hipped roof with a lower ridge height than the main roof. Windows would be similar to those in the original part of the dwelling. The gap created by the substation between the appeal site and no 18, together with the set back from the front elevation and the lower roof, is such that the proposed extension would not appear unduly dominant in the street scene.
6. Furthermore, the proposal would result in the removal of the uncharacteristic pitch roof over the existing ground floor extension which is clearly seen from the street. It would, therefore, significantly improve the appearance of the dwelling.
7. I accept that the extension is more than half of the width of the original dwelling and does not comply in this respect with the requirements of the Council's SPD. However, the proposed extension would be sufficiently subordinate to the main part of the dwelling and would sit comfortably within the street scene. As such, material considerations outweigh any conflict with the SPD and the proposal would not harm the suburban character and appearance of the dwelling or the area. It would therefore accord with the Council's development plan policies CS1 and CS5 in its Core Strategy and DM01 in its Development Management Policies document which seek to protect and enhance high quality places.
8. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring matching external materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the formal decision.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector