



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3261821

8 Cecil Road, Southgate, Barnet, London N14 5RJ

- 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 Arthur Saly against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/3664/HSE, dated 7 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing rear playroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing rear playroom at 8 Cecil Road, Southgate, Barnet, London N14 5RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/3664/HSE, dated 7 August 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. 19013.02, No. 19013.03, No. 19013.04, No. 19013.05, CR8-01, Rear Elevation Proposed, Side Elevation Proposed and Location Plan.
 - 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 accurately describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed 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 property at No. 6 Cecil Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey flat roofed extension, conservatory and detached outbuilding 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 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 single storey flat roofed extension and conservatory projecting out from the rear and across the full 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 appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property, including prior approval for 2no. 6m single storey rear extensions with a 500mm gap in between them approved in 2020¹. The proposal would entail the demolition of the existing conservatory/playroom and outbuilding at the rear and the construction of a single storey rear extension with a flat roof. The proposed rear extension would extend across the full width of the house in a staggered form and would project out overall by about 6.0m from the rear elevation of the property.
7. The appellant states that this proposed extension would be similar to the rear extensions issued with a prior approval by the Council and would fill in the 500mm gap between the approved single storey extensions. At the time of my site visit, I observed that the rear extensions issued with prior approval had not yet been implemented. Based on the evidence before me, there is a real prospect that such a development would be built if this appeal proposal is dismissed. I judge that the proposed fall-back development would have a similar impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the area to the appeal proposal and as such is a material consideration to which I attach significant weight.
8. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The proposed rear extension would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles at the rear of the host property and the surrounding properties.
9. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed 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 not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. In addition, the proposed development would not be visible from the road at the front and as such would not adversely impact on the street scene in the surrounding area.

¹ 20/2688/PNH

10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed rear extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with Policy 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 property

11. The proposed extension would be located adjacent to the two storey property at No. 6 Cecil Road (No. 6). The adjoining property at No. 6 has a small single storey rear extension leading out to a small patio area and enclosed garden area at the rear. The proposed rear extension would be inset from and project about 6.0m along the common shared boundary with No. 6 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 proposed design and layout of the development and the separation distance between the properties, I consider that the proposed rear extension, set in, would not significantly dominate the views to cause an overbearing effect and an unacceptable sense of enclosure at the rear of No. 6. The outlook at the rear of No. 6 is already toward the side elevation of the existing playroom at the rear at No. 8 and the boundary fence and the appeal site would be separated by the garden area at the rear of No. 6.
13. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed rear extension would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 6 Cecil Road with particular regard to outlook. It would be consistent with Policy DM01 of the DMP and the SPD, which I consider are relevant to this case. 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 outlook for adjoining and potential occupiers.

Conditions

14. 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

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR