
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2017

by Sue Glover BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3166637

42 Highfield Gardens, Golders Green, London, NW11 9HB

- 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 Aedifice against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/5568/FUL was refused by notice dated 18 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. This part of the street is characterised by large detached houses set back from the street behind gardens and driveways within a spacious setting. Some dwellings have been extended at the side, but for the most part there remains sufficient space between dwellings to maintain a clear separation between them. For the most part therefore they do not therefore appear as a continuous terrace and the spaces between them contribute to the spacious quality of the street scene.
 4. No. 42 has a small flat-roofed garage at the side that would be demolished. The garage adjoins the side boundary, but it is set back towards the rear of the house so that there is a good-sized gap between no. 42 and the adjacent detached house at no. 44. The garage is not a prominent feature in the street scene.
 5. No. 44 is positioned very close to the common side boundary so that with the appeal proposal there would be a narrow gap of little more than 1m between the 2-storey walls of the 2 dwellings resulting in a cramped appearance and a significant loss of spaciousness.
 6. Paragraph 14.13 "Fitting into the street" of the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (SPD) indicates that an extension should sit comfortably with the main building and with neighbouring houses by,
-

amongst other things, leaving enough space between houses to make sure they appear well separated. The policies in the SPD relating to side extensions indicate that there should normally be a minimum gap of 2 metres between the flank walls of properties at first floor level, and first floor side extensions should normally be set back 1 metre from the front main wall.

7. Without any setback from the front and only a minimal setback from the side boundary, the 2 houses would not appear well separated, and would contribute to a terracing effect. Although the proposed 2-storey extension would be set down below the main roof line and there would be matching materials, on account of its forward position it would appear unduly prominent and dominating in the street scene.
8. Taking all these matters into account, I conclude that there would be material harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. There would be conflict with the objectives of Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy), which seek the highest standards of urban design and to respect local context and distinctive local character. The proposal would be contrary to Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies), which indicates that all development should represent high quality design and should preserve or enhance local character.
9. The development plan policies are compatible with paragraphs 17 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek to secure a high quality of design, and to reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposed side extension does not meet the objectives of the Framework in these respects. It would also conflict with the objectives of the SPD.
10. The Council has raised no objection to the single storey rear extension and I find no valid reasons for objection to this aspect of the proposal. I have taken into account all other matters, including all the policies in the Framework and other national planning policy and guidance. The appeal however does not succeed.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR
