

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3173986

4 Verwood Drive, Barnet, EN4 9TP

- 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 George Marcou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 17/0729/HSE was refused by notice dated 10 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is: a two-storey side extension following demolition of existing garage. Replacement of existing conservatory with insulated roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building, terrace and Monken Hadley Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No.4 Verwood Drive is a two-storey dwelling with an adjoining garage. It is located at the end of an attractive short terrace of white rendered buildings with slate roofs. At the rear of the terrace is the car park for the Cock and Dragon public house. The appeal building is within the Monken Hadley Conservation Area.
4. Initially, the Conservation Area comprised the small settlement clustered around the church of St Mary the Virgin, Hadley Green and along the Great North Road to Hadley Highstone. It was extended later to include the northern end of Chipping Barnet High Street, with its blend of predominantly Victorian commercial and residential properties. It includes the imposing Georgian buildings of Monken Hadley and significant areas of open space.
5. The appeal building received planning permission in May 2016 for a two-storey side extension following demolition of the existing garage and replacement of conservatory with insulated roof (ref: 16/1719/HSE). The application subject to this appeal is for a similar form of development with, according to the appellant, the same overall floor area and volume.
6. The most significant changes compared to the approved scheme are to the rear, which the appellant describes as an attempt to make the new spaces created on the first floor more practical and usable. The proposed projection from the rear of the house has been reduced to 3m from the original 4m projection of the garage. This would align the rear of the extension with the existing conservatory. The first-floor extension would be wider by 1m than

that approved. The roof lines have been modified and roof lights would be used in place of first floor windows to reduce overlooking, lighting and noise overspill from the Cock and Dragon public house car park.

7. The first floor and roof of the dwelling can be seen, above a boundary wall and trellis, from public views from the Cock and Dragon public house car park. The proposed side extension would be unduly bulky when seen from the car park and would have no window to align with the existing first floor windows in the rear elevation.
8. The submitted drawings do not represent the design of the existing front door or the correct details of the front ground floor window. Both these existing design elements are characteristic of the front elevation of the terrace. The chimney is shown as removed on the proposals drawings. The rear elevation drawings fail to represent the existing first floor fenestration. The proposals drawings indicate loss of details that characterise the existing terrace and add weight to my decision that the proposal would be visually detrimental.
9. I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and terrace because of its mass and unsympathetic design. It would also fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Monken Hadley Conservation Area, contrary to Local Plan Core Strategy policy CS5 and policy DM06 of the Development Management Policies DPD. The proposal would be contrary to Core Strategy policy CS NPPF regarding sustainable development, and Core Strategy policy CS1, which concerns, amongst other things, a high standard of design. It would also conflict with policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD which seeks to preserve or enhance local character.
10. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the lack of representations from neighbours. However, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR