



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10th April 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3334505

12 Deodora Close, Whetstone, Barnet, London N20 0DQ

- 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 A Kleanthous against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 23/3761/HSE dated 1 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is to demolish the rear conservatory and erect a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the middle dwelling in a row of three dwellings – no's 11, 12 and 13. All are small dwellings and single storey. No.13 is located at the west end and no.11 at the east end. No.13 has a flat roofed rear extension. The appeal site has a flat roofed rear conservatory. The front elevation of no.12 stands behind the front building lines of no's 11 and 13. Each has a small rear garden.
4. The appeal site has planning permission dated May 2023 for a single storey rear extension of about 3m in depth with a flat roof and roof lights, to replace the existing conservatory (ref: 23/0401/HSE).
5. The proposed rear extension would have a pitched roof with an apex at about 3.9m high. It would measure approximately 4 metres in depth from the original wall, about 6.74 metres in width, along with an eaves height of about 2.34 metres. It would not have any flank windows. It would have 4 rooflights – two in each roof pitch. It would be set in from the common boundaries with no's 11 and 13 with a larger set into no.11, which has no rear extension.
6. The proposed depth of the proposal at about 4 metres is about a metre deeper than the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 'SPD' advises for terraced properties. The proposal would be deeper than the rear extension at no.13. Whilst the roof would be pitched and would slope away

from each neighbour and be lower than the main ridgeline, the resulting bulk and mass of the extension would fail to be subordinate to the host dwelling and would appear out of character and at odds with the design of the unit and its two neighbours at the rear. By reason of its scale and excessive rearward projection, it would result in a disproportionate and overly dominant development.

7. I have borne in mind that there is a fallback development (ref:23/0401/HSE) but I consider the impacts on the character and appearance of no.12 Deodora Close would be sufficiently worse to warrant refusal of planning permission.
8. Whilst it is currently difficult to see the rear of the appeal site from the public realm, this may not always be the case in the future but nevertheless there are private views of parts of it. As the proposal would harm the character of the 3 terraced units, it would also harm the visual amenity of the wider area.
9. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would be contrary to policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, policies CS1 and CS5 of the London Borough of Barnet Core Strategy DPD (adopted 2012), policy DM01 of the London Borough of Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (adopted 2012) and Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016).

Conclusion

10. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR