
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3300658

48 East End Road, Finchley, Barnet London N3 3QU

- 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 Mrs Ramit Hacco Cohn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/0543/HSE, dated 3 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a second floor extension with crown roof and rear window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site visit was originally scheduled to be undertaken on the basis of the appellant allowing access to the property. However, the site visit was undertaken on an unaccompanied basis and viewed from the available public viewpoints along Windermere Avenue.
3. For reason of clarity and brevity, the Council's description of development has been adopted.

Main Issue

4. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The proposed extension includes the erection of a roof extension above a 2-storey addition to the rear of a pair of 2-storey semi-detached dwellings. The rear elevations of these dwellings have already been altered by both rear additions and roof extensions. The scale of the alterations to No. 50 has already unbalanced the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings when viewed from Windermere Avenue.
6. From Windermere Avenue, the appeal scheme would not be such a conspicuous or prominent addition to the property so as to detract from the spacious and verdant character and appearance of the surrounding residential area. However, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design*

Guide (RDG) refers to rear extensions not looking too bulky and prominent compared to the size of the main building and garden to which they relate.

7. In this case, because of its design, scale and bulk the proposed development would appear to add a third floor to the existing 2-storey addition. The increase in the height of the rear extension would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the original 2-storey host property. This assessment is made notwithstanding the rear roof dormer which has been erected. Further, the cumulative size of the existing and proposed extensions would represent a prominent addition to the property rather than a subservient form of development.
8. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) (CS), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) (DMP) and the RDG. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to development representing high quality design. CS Policy CS1 is a strategic statement of intent rather than a development management policy and, as stated in the Planning Officer's report, the property is not affected by local or national designations, including heritage assets, so the relevance of DMP Policy DM06 to the appeal scheme is unclear. Although these policies are not of direct relevance to the appeal scheme, this assessment does not alter the conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR