



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3276042

60 Mowbray Road, Edgware, Middlesex HA8 8JH

- 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 Kishore Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/5923/HSE, dated 23 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension following demolition of detached rear bunker.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension following demolition of detached rear bunker at 60 Mowbray Road, Edgware, Middlesex HA8 8JH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/5923/HSE, dated 23 November 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: Site Location Plan, KS/2020/01 Rev B, KS/2020/02 Rev A and KS/2020/03 Rev A.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached extended dwelling located at the end of a row of semi-detached properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. A service road serving the rear of a terrace of commercial properties to the south of the site runs alongside the appeal property and the immediate area is mixed use in nature. The single storey extensions/buildings at the rear of the terrace of commercial buildings, provide a varied context and palette of materials in the immediate surroundings.

4. 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 single storey and two storey flat roofed extension projecting 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.
5. The proposed single storey flat roofed extension would wrap around the south-east corner of the property and would extend across the full width of the house with a staggered form in line with the single storey rear extension at the adjoining property at No. 62 Mowbray Road.
6. 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 rear of the appeal property and the surrounding properties.
7. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed single storey 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.
8. 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 and the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016. 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.
9. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 56, 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

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR