

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

**by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE**

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

**Decision date: 13 January 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3160358**  
**143 Hadley Road, Barnet EN5 5QN**

- 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 Andreas Polychronis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 16/3542/HSE, dated 27 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as demolition of existing garage, construction of a two storey side & rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side and rear extension with Juliette balcony at rear first floor level at 143 Hadley Road, Barnet EN5 5QN, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref:16/3542/HSE, dated 27 May 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Block Plan; Drawing Nos 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.
  - 3) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

### Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of the development of application ref: 16/3542/HSE to 'demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side and rear extension with Juliette balcony at rear first floor level'. This is a more accurate description of the development which I have therefore used in my decision.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
-

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a prominent two storey detached, bay fronted, dwelling located on a relatively large corner plot at the junction of Hadley Road and Latimer Road. The space between the side of the dwelling and Latimer Road is currently occupied by a large single storey detached garage. Properties on the northern side of Latimer Road comprises of substantial dwellings set in large grounds and as such the area around the junction appears spacious.
5. Although Nos 139 and 141 Hadley Road, which appear to also have been extended, are constructed of a similar design style to the appeal property, the area in the vicinity comprises of residential properties of varying design styles, scale and construction ages. As such, the form of built development in the locality displays no consistent character.
6. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the existing detached garage and the erection of a two storey side and rear extension which would have a hipped roof with brickwork and design features to match the host dwelling. The side extension would be set back from the existing front elevation of the property. There would be a tapering gap of approximately 4m to 1m between the proposed side elevation and the property boundary with Latimer Road. The proposed fenestration to the front would match that of the existing property. The rear elevation would contain bi-fold doors at the ground floor level and French windows with a Juliette balcony at first floor level.
7. Although the proposed extension is relatively large, it reflects the form, scale, proportions and architectural style of the original property. Both the scale and mass of the existing dwelling and the plot size are sufficient to accommodate an extension of this size without it appearing overly dominant or resulting in a cramped form of development. Nor would it appear unduly prominent or incongruous. I consider that in views from Hadley Road it would appear as being subordinate to the existing dwelling. As such, I do not consider that the character or appearance of the existing street scene would be unacceptably harmed.
8. To an extent the proposed extension would provide some balance to the visual appearance of the front of the property by providing the facade with a degree of symmetrical construction either side of the dominant front bay. This would enhance the prominence of the front bay which is a key feature of the design style of the property. At ground floor level the space between built development on the plot and the property boundary with Latimer Road would be increased as a consequence of the removal of the garage although there would be a reduction in the visual gap to Latimer Road at first floor level which would have some impact on the spaciousness of the area around the junction.
9. However, taking into account the fact that the appeal site is at a lower level to Latimer Road and the fact that there would still be a reasonable gap between built development and the road, I consider that there would still be an acceptable appearance of spaciousness both on the corner plot and around the junction. Consequently, I do not consider that the proposed development materially conflicts with the guidance provided in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide (SPD) with particular regard to the need to maintain the perception of spaciousness on corner plots.

10. Whilst I recognise that the Juliet balcony and expanse of glazing at the rear ground floor may not be reflective of the fenestration at the front of the property, this can also be said of the existing rear fenestration. Owing to the topography of the appeal site and the existence of the substantial close boarded timber boundary fence, the proposed rear ground floor bi-fold doors would not be readily visible in public views. Given the eclectic character of the street scene and in particular the varied design styles of the rear of the properties on this side of Hadley Road, I do not consider that the proposed French windows and Juliette Balcony would be so at odds with the character of the area to cause demonstrable harm.
11. Taking the above factors into consideration, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would not therefore conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies Document (2012). These policies, amongst other things, require that development displays a high quality design that contributes to the creation of a quality environment and preserves local character and respects the scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding development.

### **Conditions**

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition concerning the external materials to be used.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the above reasons and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Stephen Normington*

INSPECTOR