
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 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: 7 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/17/3171666

63 Holdenhurst Avenue, North Finchley, London N12 0HY

- 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 Claire Disbery against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/6263/FUL, dated 21 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage/outbuilding and partial demolition of the utility space to erect a self-contained residential unit adjoining to the existing dwelling (63 Holdenhurst Avenue).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage/outbuilding and partial demolition of the utility space to erect a self-contained residential unit adjoining to the existing dwelling at 63 Holdenhurst Avenue, North Finchley, London N12 0HY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/6263/FUL, dated 21 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: 490-01 Rev B; 490-2 Rev A; 490-3 Rev A; 490-4 Rev A; 490-5 Rev C; 490-5.1 Rev B; 490-6 Rev B; 490-8 Rev B; 490-9 Rev B; 490-10 Rev D.
 - 3) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the side garden of No 63 Holdenhurst Avenue which is partly occupied by a detached garage and a small side extension. It is located on the southern side of Holdenhurst Avenue comprises predominantly of semi-detached dwellings set with a regular spaced small gap between the
-

pairs of properties which are designed with projecting front gables, bay windows and accommodation in the roof space. The host property and its adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 61 have a small side projecting wing with the ridge of the roof set at a considerably lower height than that of the main part of the dwelling. However, the properties on both sides of this pair of semi's are of a more contemporary design with Nos 65 and 67 being a three storey maisonette and No 57 being a detached dwelling. The gap between the appeal property and Nos 65 and 67 is wider than others on the street.

4. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the garage and side extension and the construction of a residential unit that would be attached to the side wing of the host property. The front elevation would be set back from that of the existing dwelling and the ridge and eaves height would be commensurate with that of the side wing. The gap of 2m that would be formed between the side elevation of the proposed dwelling and that of the adjacent maisonettes at Nos 65 and 67 would be reflective of the gap that exists between the majority of properties on this side of the street. Consequently, the proposal would not result in the appearance of terracing.
5. I note that the design of the proposed development has been considerably revised from that considered by my colleague Inspector in the previous appeal decision (Ref APP/N5090/W/16/3143309). The design of the proposed front elevation would now be reflective of the architectural features of the host property with a projecting front gable, front bay and matching materials and the entrance door to the side elevation. As a consequence of these design features and the revisions made to the height of the roof, I agree with the appellant that its appearance in the street scene would be that of a subordinate extension to the host property which would not be visibly read as a separate dwelling.
6. Notwithstanding the fact that the properties on the opposite side of Holdenhurst Avenue are terraced properties, given the design changes made since the previous appeal, the proposed development would not be read as a terrace of three dwellings. In addition, given the localised circumstances of the appeal site with a wider gap at the side of No 63, the proposed dwelling would result in spatial pattern of development that is reflective of the gap that exists between adjacent properties on this side of the street.
7. I recognise that Council's concerns that the proposal could result in an unbalancing of this pair of semi-detached properties. However, given the localised circumstances of the appeal site, the subservient nature of the design and the fact that the large projecting gables of the central part of these properties would be retained as the dominant feature, the proposed dwelling would be visibly read as an extension with harmonising design details. Consequently, I do not consider that the addition of the proposed dwelling to the side of the host property would unbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings to an extent that would cause significant harm to the appearance of these properties in the street scene.
8. Although the proposal would result in a localised change to this part of the street scene, taking the above factors into account, this change would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, there would be no conflict with Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2015), Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan

Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance. These policies, amongst other matters, require development to be of the highest standard of design and respect local context and distinctive character.

Other matters

9. I have taken into account the concerns of local residents regarding the effects of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, the availability of on-street parking spaces, increased traffic and concerns about the impact of constructing the proposed development. Although these matters have been carefully noted, they do not alter the main issue which has been identified as the basis for the determination of this appeal, particularly in circumstances where the Council has not objected to the appeal scheme for these other reasons.

Conditions

10. Although the Council has not suggested any conditions, 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 for 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

11. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR