



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2022

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3303536

25 Dene Road, New Southgate, London N11 1ES

- 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 Holly Dinn against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/6521/RCU, dated 7 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a Retrospective single storey rear extension, with rear external decking staircase, demolition of existing rear outrigger, alterations to fence siting and side access gate siting and proposed 1.8m privacy screens (Amended Plans) (Amended Description).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a Retrospective single storey rear extension, with rear external decking staircase, demolition of existing rear outrigger, alterations to fence siting and side access gate siting and proposed 1.8m privacy screens; in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/6521/RCU, dated 7 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall be maintained in perpetuity and in accordance with the approved drawings listed below, unless further planning permission is sought from the Local Planning Authority:

- 'Ground Floor Extension,' Drg No. 1017/EP02, Dated Mar.2021;
- 'Side Elevation as Existing and Proposed,' Drg No. 1017/EP03, Dated Mar.2021;
- 'Ground Floor Plan as Existing and Proposed,' Drg No. 1017/EP01, Dated Mar.2021;
- 'Proposed Plans,' Drg No. BC100, Dated 2021;

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's Decision Notice which provides more detail as to the elements requiring planning consent. It is noted that this description is also included on the appellant's appeal form.
3. Upon my site visit, the rear extension, decking and screens were in situ. I have therefore made my judgement based upon this.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding locality.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located along Dene Road, which forms one of a number of streets in the local area that contains formally laid out speculative housing which appears to date from the early-mid twentieth century. The dwellings within this location are functional in design, two storey semi-detached dwellings with hipped rooves with some dwellings having a two storey protruding bow window with mock timber frame gables, and examples of semi-detached dwellings with large protruding gables, both designs of which are arts and crafts inspired. The dwellings are positioned to follow the road and have a consistent setback and positioning in relation to the road edge and surrounding dwellings. Rear gardens are well-sized however there is a change in gradient with the topography dropping from the dwelling to the rear garden. The tops of trees in rear gardens are visible from gaps in between dwellings. These elements together with vegetated front boundary treatments, street trees and front gardens assist in reinforcing positive qualities that contribute to local character and distinctiveness. A number of additions and extensions are evident throughout the estate, which have a subservient appearance that does not detract from the original proportions of the dwellings that make up the planned estate.
6. The appeal site displays a number of positive qualities which are experienced within the locality, and appears to be one of the original semi-detached properties of the estate, and with the front garden and similar design elements to the estate, contributes positively alongside the other dwellings which make up the locality.
7. In undertaking extensions and alterations to existing buildings, the London Borough of Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) Policy CS5 seeks to ensure that redevelopment delivers a high quality design by respecting local context and distinctive local character. The London Borough of Barnet Development Management Policies (DMP) Policy DM01 seeks to encourage development that provides positive characteristics such as understanding context, be high quality in design, form, scale, layout and the spaces around them, amongst others. These policies are supported by the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) which offers guidance on specific elements of designing new schemes and alterations, taking into account context and character, amongst others.
8. The RDG suggests that not all houses can be extended and that extensions can individually and cumulatively have a profound effect on the appearance of an area. As such it is necessary to give consideration to elements such as amenity, harmony, materials and details and fitting into the street, amongst others. For rear extensions the RDG suggests that extensions of three metres for a semi-detached property is normally acceptable, however further consideration regarding extensions need to take into account the depth and height, visual bulk, prominence, the remaining garden space, and the levels of the property when compared with neighbouring properties, amongst others.

9. The extension to the rear along with the small area of decking is confined to the rear and whilst it is single storey, as a result of the topography of the site, the extension requires a plinth to enable it to meet the floor level of the existing dwelling, increasing the height of the building above what would normally be appropriate, particularly in relation to the gap between the first floor and the loss of bay window to the rear. Having visited the site, the proposed extension to the rear would not appear overly unusual or incongruous for a dwelling such as this when compared to neighbouring dwellings.
10. In this particular example, the approach undertaken sits appropriately within the rear façade, and is subservient in proportion and style to the existing dwelling. The extension would be subservient to the host building in terms of its width, height and construction as well as being subservient when seen in its wider context against neighbouring buildings, such as No.23 which has a rear decking of similar height to the appeal site. I disagree that in this context that the preservation of the building's original character is paramount, and given the existing proportions and design, many of the original elements are still appreciable.
11. In conclusion of this matter, the proposed scheme would present an appropriate architectural approach which is subservient, high quality and would be in keeping with the site and its context. Consequently, the rear extension would be an appropriate alteration to the existing dwelling that would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the existing building or the greater locality. The scheme would therefore be compliant with CS Policy CS5 and DMP Policy DM01, which is supported by the RDG.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For these reasons, and having considered all matters raised in evidence and from what I saw during my site visit, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions as detailed in the annex accompanying this decision.
13. I refer to the suggested conditions specified by the Council in their Questionnaire, if the appeal was to be allowed and have considered them in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The Council have suggested the standard time limit condition and a matching materials condition, however there are not necessary given that the application has already been commenced. It is however necessary to include a condition relating to the approved plans, and the approval in those plans of elements such as the screening installed between dwellings and the appearance of the scheme.

J Somers
INSPECTOR