



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2017

by D Guiver LLB(Hons) Solicitor

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

Decision date: 18 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/17/3174829

34 Brookside South, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 8LN

- 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 Charalambides against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 17/1459/FUL, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension to No 34 Brookside South and erection of end of terrace house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Brookside South is a wide street with grass verges and footpaths abutting generous front gardens resulting in a pleasant suburban street scene. The surrounding area is largely residential and dwellings are predominantly semi-detached houses, though there are a few short stretches of terraced housing nearby. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached properties. The proposed development is for the erection of an end of terrace house of similar design and proportions to the appeal property, and for a rear extension. The proposed development would result in the creation of a short terrace of three houses.
4. The Council does not object to the proposed rear extension at the appeal property, which it considers to be subordinate to the host building and to respect the character of the area. However, the rear extension would be constructed as part of the overall scheme and cannot be separated from the similar structure proposed for the rear of the additional house.
5. The appeal site sits close to the road junction between Brookside South and Friars Walk, which ascends a shallow incline eastwards from Brookside South. Housing in Friars Walk is overwhelmingly semi-detached and buildings sit back from the road with generous front gardens and large overall plots. The appeal site, being a corner property, has a larger than average plot with space to the

side as well as to the front and rear. The space between the side elevation and the road is an important feature that adds significantly to the open, suburban appearance of the area.

6. The existing view from Brookside South reveals a line of semi-detached properties in Friars Walk that curves away to the north-east. The front elevations of these dwellings align with the side elevation of the appeal property to create a consistent building line. The proposed development would obliterate this building line and would significantly narrow the current open aspect at the junction. Because the appeal site is at the bottom of the incline, the houses in Friars Walk would appear to sit above and behind the proposed new dwelling, and this would have an alien and detrimental effect on the street scene.
7. The proposed development would create a short terrace of three houses, rather than the existing pair of semi-detached properties. While there are other terraces in the area, these are sited within the context of the area as a whole. The appeal site is clearly part of a semi-detached pair and is similar in design to many of the other semi-detached properties nearby. The creation of a terrace would sit uncomfortably in the street scene and would cause unacceptable harm to the current rhythm of development. The position of the appeal site at a junction would make the proposed development more noticeable and would exacerbate the detrimental impact of the scheme.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy) and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 Plan (the Development Policies), which seek to ensure that developments achieve a high standard of design that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposed development would also not accord with the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 (the SPG). The SPG is a material consideration and is consistent with, and informs, the Core Strategy and Development Policies, and I therefore give it significant weight.
10. The appellant has referred to three developments in the area at 36 Brookside South, 53 Knoll Drive and 157 Hampden Way. No 36 sits on the opposite side of the junction with Friars Walk to the appeal site and has the benefit of a two-storey side extension. This extension is significantly narrower than the proposed new dwelling and although it sits flush with the front elevation of the host building and continues the same roofline, its design and use of contrasting materials result in a proportionate and subservient addition to the property. I consider that the extension to No 36 is not comparable in design, scale or siting to the proposed development and therefore give it little weight.
11. No 53 Knoll Drive is a detached property 300 metres or so from the appeal site and is constructed at the end of a row of semi-detached houses and on the same building line as those properties. No 53 sits at the junction between Knoll Drive and Monkfrith Way. However, unlike the juxtaposition of Friars Walk and the appeal site, there are not any houses on Monkfrith Way between Knoll Drive and Brookside South. On the opposite side of Monkfrith Way is an open area within the curtilage of Monkfrith Primary School. The differences in

the area surrounding No 53 and the appeal site mean that they are not comparable and therefore I give it little weight.

12. No 157 Hampden Way is approximately half a mile from the appeal site and sits at the junction of Hampden Way and Summit Way. While Hampden Way has a mixture of residential and commercial properties, it is predominantly residential in the area around No 157, though at this point it is approximately two-thirds the width of Brookside South.
13. No 157 was originally one of a pair of semi-detached houses and following an appeal (APP/N5090/W/14/3001159) planning permission was granted for the construction of an additional dwelling on its side elevation. This permission has been implemented and has created a terrace of three houses with the additional house built very close to the boundary and the footpath on Summit Way.
14. I consider that the development at No 157 is comparable to the proposed development despite the significant distance between them. However, the impact of the development at No 157 on the street scene at Hampden Way and Summit Way differs from the proposed development because of the narrower constraints of these roads compared to those surrounding the appeal site. In particular, the houses in Friars Walk have larger front garden areas and there is a grass verge between the road and footpath giving a more open suburban appearance in the vicinity of the appeal site. In contrast, the area in the vicinity of No 157 has a more urban appearance, especially on Summit Way, where houses sit significantly closer to the carriageway. The SPG specifically refers to the setback of buildings from the road as one of the elements that defines an area's character.
15. In any event, I must consider this appeal on its merits and although there are considerable similarities between the site and the development at No 157 these are not sufficient to overcome the significant harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area around the appeal site.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR