



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2017

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 10th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3181299

New, 45 Great North Way, Hendon, London NW4 1PT

- 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 N. L. Homorodeanu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 17/3241/HSE, dated 18 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "construction of single storey rear extension. Extension to roof comprising of reconfiguration and changing geometry".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development on the application form as shown above does not provide sufficient clarity with respect to the first floor and roof extensions. The Council amended the description during the application process to "single storey rear extension and first floor side extension. Extension to roof including new pitched roof with gable end" with the agreement of the appellant. I consider that this provides a clearer and more accurate description of development

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated in a run of mostly semi-detached properties on the north side of Great North Way. The properties face towards the busy road junction and flyover for the A1, A41 and M1, which creates a noisy and highly urbanised environment. The semi-detached properties have consistent architectural features including gable roofs on the front elevation with cat-slide roofs to one side of each gable. The properties have hipped main roofs, although hip to gable roof extensions have occurred at several properties. Despite these extensions, gaps between most properties are regular and wide enough to provide reasonable visual separation between each pair of properties.
5. The appeal property originally formed part of 45A Great North Way before planning permission was granted in November 2015 (ref 15/06168/FUL) to

convert the original dwelling into three self-contained residential units. Shortly before that, permission was granted at appeal (ref APP/N5090/D/15/3032622) for a gable pitched roof extension at first floor level over an existing single storey side extension that mimics the front gable roofs of the semi-detached properties. This extension now forms part of the appeal property. The extension has altered the balance of the original pair of semi-detached properties at Nos 45A and 47 and there is now a short terrace of three houses. The extension has also filled in part of the gap between the appeal property and No 43A, but due to its steeply pitched side roof and subservient relationship to the original dwelling at No 45A, there remains a reasonable visual separation between the appeal property and No 43A.

6. The Council has no objection to the proposed single storey rear extension, and I have no reason to disagree. The proposed first floor side extension and roof extension would mimic the first floor at No 45A and its existing hip to gable roof extension along with several other hip to gable extensions nearby. It would not unbalance the appeal property or the short terrace of properties any more than they are currently unbalanced. The roof extension would be subservient to the ridgeline at No 45A.
7. However, there would be little set back behind the front gable of the appeal property, with the plans indicating that there would be no cat-slide element to the side unlike the front gables of other properties. Moreover, the first floor side and roof extensions would fill much of the remaining gap between the appeal property and No 43A with a new vertical flank wall just off the side boundary. A very narrow gap would be created, eroding the visual separation between the two properties. When viewed from in front of the property, the development would appear overly dominant and cramped next to No 43A. Given the regular and reasonable gaps between properties elsewhere on this stretch of Great North Way, it would look conspicuous and out of place. The noisy and highly urbanised environment does not justify poor design, and the extensions would still be visible from the pavement and roads past the site.
8. Concluding on this main issue, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. Therefore, it would not accord with Policy CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy 2012 or Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies Document 2012 which, amongst other things, seek high quality design that respect local context and character. The development would also conflict with the Barnet Residential Design Guidance 2016 which seeks to maintain adequate gaps between properties in terms of side extensions, with a minimum gap of 2 metres between the flank walls of properties at first floor level. It would also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires good design that improves the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR