



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2023

by J N Seymour BA (hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date 26th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3313882

2 Southway, London, N20 8EA

- 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 Wendy Fahri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 22/1854/HSE, dated 7 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2022.
 - The development is described as 'Roof extension involving side and rear dormer windows. First floor rear extension and alterations to roof of existing ground floor side extension and first floor side and rear extensions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the development, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 2143-01, 2143-02B, 2143-03, 2143-04, 2143-05B Revision D, 2143-06B, 2143-07B Revision D, 2143-08B and site location plan.
 - 3) The walling and roofing materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is number 2 Southway, a detached dwelling on a residential street which is characterised by detached dwellings of a similar size and scale. The appeal proposal involves alterations and extensions to the rear, side and roof of the dwelling, including the insertion of two dormer windows on the north elevation.
4. The Council has stated in their delegated report that there would be no harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties and that both the side extensions and dormer windows are acceptable. The Council has also confirmed the proposal would not be harmful to the setting of the nearby

Totteridge Conservation Area. Therefore, the area of disagreement centres on the size and design of the first floor rear extension element of the appeal proposal.

5. The Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (SPD) does not offer guidance specifically for first floor rear extensions, however such a development has a similar effect to a two-storey rear extension and for these cases the SPD states they are not normally acceptable when they are closer than 2 metres to a neighbouring boundary and project more than 3 metres in depth. The Council confirms in their delegated report that the depth of the first floor rear extension is 3 metres, therefore the SPD guidance is not exceeded in this case.
6. The reason given for these parameters is to prevent extensions becoming too bulky and dominant, and to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents. It has already been established that the Council does not consider the living conditions of neighbouring residents to be harmed by the proposal.
7. The section of the first floor rear extension that is closest to the neighbouring property at number 4 Southway is comprised of an existing flat-roofed first floor section of the dwelling. I have not been provided with the distance of existing first floor side (south) elevation from the neighbouring property, however the important factor here is that the proposed extensions would not extend any closer to number 4. Therefore, the appeal proposal complies with the aims of the SPD in this regard.
8. By incorporating the existing flat-roof sections into the first floor extensions, the dwelling is not enlarged beyond its existing footprint, therefore I do not agree with the Council that there would be excessive width or rearward projection in this case. The proposed hipped roof design would integrate effectively with the existing hipped roof structure and the general design of the main dwelling. This will help to reduce the bulk and massing of the proposed first floor rear extension, and its overall height would be no higher than the existing dwelling, or other dwellings in the surrounding area.
9. For these reasons, I do not find that the extensions are excessively bulky or dominant, rather they extend upon the existing uncharacteristic flat-roof sections and create a hipped roof dwelling on all elevations. The result is a more coherent appearance to the dwelling as a whole, which helps to preserve the local character whilst respecting the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, as advocated in Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies 2012 (DPD). I have also found the proposal complies with Policy D3 of the London Plan as the extensions are the most appropriate form for the site and they respond to the site's context.
10. To ensure the extensions are constructed in a manner that they integrate with the main dwelling, a condition requesting matching walling and roofing materials has been included in this decision.

Other Matters

11. The Council has cited Policies CS1 and CS5 from the Council's Local Plan Core Strategy. CS1 is a strategic policy relating to the number of new homes to be built in the Borough over the plan period, which is not relevant to this householder appeal. Policy CS5 relates to creating buildings of high quality

design and I have explained above that the extension has been appropriately designed, thereby satisfying this policy.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons contained in this letter, I conclude that the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

J N Seymour

INSPECTOR