

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3313593

23 George Crescent, Muswell Hill, Barnet, London N10 1AL

- 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 Ms Angela Demetriou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/5134/HSE, dated 19 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new double storey rear extension to a single family dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new double storey rear extension to a single family dwelling in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/5134/HSE, dated 19 October 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 283_P_001, 283_P_010, 283_P_020, 283_P_110 and 283_P_210.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building except as otherwise specified on the application form.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - (i) The character and appearance of the house and local area; and
 - (ii) Living conditions at the next door houses, 21 and 25 George Crescent, in terms of outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 23 George Crescent is a 2 storey semi-detached house on a street of similar houses. The proposal is to add a 2 storey rear extension across almost the full width of the building, stepping down to a single storey at the back.
4. The extension would be modest in depth and simple in design, in proportion with the size of the house and in keeping with the relatively plain designs of houses on George Crescent. It would be much lower than the main roof and would not project out far to the rear. It would only be glimpsed from the street, in views through the gap between Nos 23 and 25, and would not be intrusive in any private views from neighbouring properties.
5. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the house or the local area. It accords with the shared aims of London Plan policy D3, Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) policies CS1 and CS5, Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (DMP) policy DM01 and the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (RDG), to secure high quality design that responds to the individual character of a place.

Living conditions

6. The Council's concern here is not clear. The decision notice refers to harm to living conditions at 25 George Crescent, but the report states that the objection relates to living conditions at the other half of the pair of semi-detached houses, No 21.
7. The extension would be set close to the boundary with No 21, which has a ground floor window to a habitable room near to the boundary fence. The 2 storey part of the proposed extension, however, would only be about 2m deep with its hipped roof sloping away from No 21. The single storey section would extend just a metre farther. This scale of addition would have little impact on No 21's outlook and daylight (light from the sky). The property would retain a fairly open aspect to the rear. Although the proposal would sit to the south of No 21, its shallow depth at 2 stories would mean that direct overshadowing would be limited to a short period each day.
8. There is a reasonable gap between Nos 23 and 25, plus No 25 is at a slightly higher level and extends further to the rear. The proposed shallow depth rear extension would therefore have no significant effect on outlook or light at No 25.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not significantly affect living conditions at the neighbouring properties, Nos 21 and 25, in terms of outlook and light. It also accords with the shared aims of CS policies CS1 and CS5, DMP policy DM01, the RDG and the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document, to secure high quality design that allows for adequate daylight, sunlight and outlook for adjoining occupiers

Conditions

10. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is also necessary, to protect local character and appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR