

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2016

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3156382

116 Park Road, Barnet, Hertfordshire, EN4 9QR

- 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 Mr & Mrs M Greenberg against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/0448/HSE, dated 21 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new front porch; roof extension involving hip to gable to both sides, 2no. rear and 2no. front dormer windows to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new front porch; roof extension involving hip to gable to both sides, 2no. rear and 2no. front dormer windows to facilitate a loft conversion at 116 Park Road, Barnet, Hertfordshire, EN4 9QR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/0448/HSE, dated 21 January 2016, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SA6/M6/100B, 200B, 300B, 400B, 500B, 600B & 700B.

Procedural Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the planning application form; I note the appeal form also uses this description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached hipped roof chalet bungalow in a generous plot on a stretch of road comprising mainly spacious and varied styles of
-

property which along with their gardens come together to form an area of established residential character and pleasing appearance. The appeal proposal is as described above and would principally provide increased bedroom and bathroom accommodation.

5. The Council is concerned that the roof extensions would appear unduly prominent, obtrusive and incongruous in the context of the host building and the wider locality. Certainly the scheme would lead to a chalet bungalow of considerable massing although this needs to be seen in the context of the large plot, the sizeable homes found locally and the varied range of dwellings nearby and alongside which includes full two storey properties. Most dwellings in this stretch have hipped roofs but not all and I see scope here for gable ends without any disruption to, for example, rhythm, important visual gaps or symmetry. The front elevation would ultimately have four dormer windows and given the space between them, the degree of principal pitched roof visible all round and their own pitched hipped style that would not seem excessive or cramped to my mind. The design of the new windows would reflect the existing and at the front suitably align with what lies below.
6. Overall I would consider the roof extensions would respect the style of original building, would not be over-bearing thereon and would sit comfortably in relation to the host property and the wider scene.
7. The Council is also concerned about the scale, prominence and siting of the planned front porch. However, I observed that there is no fixed building line along this stretch of road with, for example, the adjoining property's garage being a marked 'step forward'. With the appeal site having a reasonable size of front curtilage the proposed porch, at a two metres projection and with a single storey pitched roof construction, would not strike one as jarring in the scene or over-prominent in my opinion. The design would be relatively low key and the pitch would mirror that found over the two bay windows. The proximity of the porch to those windows would be somewhat unusual but I would not agree with the Council that this would represent unacceptable incongruity. The principal front elevation will still read as an attractive proposition with the relationship of the porch to the windows not being harmful aesthetically.
8. Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policy document and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, taken together and amongst other matters, call for suitably scaled high quality design sympathetic to a site's wider setting and ensuring protection of local distinctiveness and character generally. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies.
9. Furthermore, there would not be conflict with the objectives of the Authority's Residential Design Guidance SPD (2013) which reflects these policy aims and in any event could not be expected to cover every situation.
10. I would add that from what I have seen and read the dismissed appeal decision referred to by the Council (APP/N5090/D/14/2218514) does not relate to a situation directly comparable to the case in hand. The host property and its neighbours in that case are of a particular Art Deco style, the intended works are not precisely the same and the location is not directly proximate. In any event I must deal with the present appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conditions

11. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans as this provides certainty.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR