
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3270706
142 Green Lane Edgware HA8 8EJ

- 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 B Phillips against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref. 20/5332/HSE, dated 9 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension. Alteration to rear fenestration to include a patio. Internal ground floor alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension, alteration to rear fenestration to include a patio and internal ground floor alterations at 142 Green Lane Edgware HA8 8EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 20/5332/HSE, dated 9 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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 following approved plans: Drg. No 3012/1 - Existing Floor Plans, Drg. No 3012/2- Existing Elevations, Drg. No 3012/3A – Proposed Floor Plans and Drg No. 3012/4A – Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the submission of the appeal the London Plan 2021 has been published. The Council's reason for refusal includes a policy within the London Plan 2016. The London Plan 2021 does not diverge significantly from the previous plan in terms of seeking to create a strong sense of place and achieve high quality design appropriate to the local context. Given the circumstances of the appeal before me, it does not raise fresh considerations necessitating further comment by the parties in this case.
3. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that the appellant's agent has also utilised this description on the appeal form. I have

used the Council's description of the development as this provides a more succinct description.

4. The development, the subject of the proposal, consists of a number of different elements. The Council has raised no objections in relation to the alterations to the rear fenestration to include a patio and the internal ground floor alterations. I agree with the Council and am content to deal only with the proposed first floor rear extension in my decision.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, 142 Green Lane, (No 142) is a detached property situated in a residential area where there is a variety of residential design and form. The proposed development would materially alter the appearance of the rear elevation of No 142 and the resultant dwelling would be substantially larger. However this does not automatically equate to harm. Within the context of the scale of No 142 and its sizeable garden, the proposed extension would not appear excessive in size. Whilst it would be built upon the full width of the existing ground floor extension, the extension's ridge line would be appreciably lower than that of the existing dwelling and the use of a hipped roof would reduce the scale of the extension. These aspects would serve to underline the extension's subservience. The design would reflect that of the main dwelling in terms of the nature of the fenestration and roof style proposed and would add visual interest and break up the mass of the rear elevation.
7. No 142 has substantial mature vegetation and shrubbery in the rear garden which screens views of the rear elevation from neighbouring properties. No other first floor full width rear extensions could be viewed from the outlook obtained, which accords with the Council's indication that aerial maps do not show other first floor full width rear extensions within the surrounding area. Nonetheless from the views obtained I did not observe a consistent rear building line to the properties on Green Lane. Given the extent of the shrubbery and the juxtaposition of the dwellings on Green Lane, the proposed extension would not excessively dominate the appearance of the setting in views from the surrounding gardens. Nor would the proposed extension be visible from Green Lane or any public vantage points. The impact of the proposed development on the wider scene would be negligible and acceptable.
8. I conclude that the development would not result in unacceptable harm either to the host property or the surrounding area. As such it would not be in conflict with the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) Policies CS1 and CS5, and the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policy DM01 which together require a high standard of design which respects the local context. In addition, it would not be in conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guidance (2016) which requires extensions to be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building and not to be overly dominant. It would also not be in conflict with policies within the London Plan, 2021 which promote good design.

Other Matter

9. A third party has raised in addition to issues as to scale concerns including noise, privacy and overshadowing issues. I note that the Council does not raise concerns over any loss of privacy, and impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring residents. Given the separation distances and set back between both neighbouring properties, I would concur with their assessment.

Conditions

10. Conditions in respect of timescales and specifying the approved plans are necessary as this provides certainty. A condition regarding the materials to be used is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given and having taken all other matters into account, I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR