



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/20/3249090

17 Reddings Close, Mill Hill, London, NW7 4JL

- 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 & Mrs S Levy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/6596/HSE, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey and two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey and two storey front extension at 17 Reddings Close, Mill Hill, London, NW7 4JL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/6596/HSE, dated 12 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 plan: 2019/1346-2.
 - 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. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, sited at the end of a row of three detached dwellings and adjacent to the head of the cul-de-sac. It occupies a wide plot and has a large side garden with generous separation between it and the dwellings at the head of the cul-de-sac. The land rises significantly towards the head of the cul-de-sac.
3. The other dwellings in the street, which include both semi-detached and detached dwellings, are built in a similar style with hipped roofs. Like the appeal dwelling, many have been extended to the front and side elevations and there is a variety of sizes and styles of extensions. As with the existing two storey extension to the appeal dwelling, the first floor elements generally remain either in line or set back from the original front wall. Even so, the other two dwellings in this row of three have both been significantly extended and it

is difficult to distinguish the extensions from the original form of the dwellings. Moreover, the adjacent property in the top corner of the head of the cul-de-sac has a first floor extension which projects forward of the original front elevation. Nonetheless each of these dwellings has an attractive form and appearance, which retains a staggered building line and respects the prevailing hipped roof forms and spacious character of the area.

4. The proposed development would extend forwards of the existing side extension at first floor level and at ground floor level across the existing bay window to align with the porch, to provide an extended dining area and a larger main bedroom and ensuite. It would have a hipped roof with a ridge height significantly lower than the existing hipped roof. Window openings would match those of the existing. I have noted that the Council raises no objection to the ground floor element and agree that, given its shallow depth and the number of similar front extensions on the street, this would be acceptable.
5. Whilst the first floor would project forward of the original front wall and in this respect would be contrary to the requirements of the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD and thereby its development plan policy DM02 in its Development Management Policies document, the proposal nevertheless retains a staggered building line. Although the proposed roof would be of a different size from the existing, it would have the same degree of pitch and would merge into the existing roof. I therefore disagree with the Council that this would result in a messy roof junction or would be incongruous. The smaller but matching roof form and its lower ridge height, together with the relatively small scale of the projection compared to the existing building form would result in a sufficiently subordinate appearance. The dwelling would retain its principal characteristics of a hipped roof and a staggered building line.
6. For these reasons and given the surrounding context of other substantially extended dwellings, I conclude that in this case, material considerations outweigh any conflict with the Council's SPD and development plan policy DM02 in its Development Management Policies document and the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the area. It would therefore accord with the Council's development plan policies CS5 in its Core Strategy and DM01 in its Development Management Policies document which seek to protect and enhance high quality places.
7. 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.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the formal decision.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector