



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2017

**by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 11 October 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3179103**

**18 Snowberry Close, Barnet, London EN5 5FS**

- 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 R Hewison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 17/1752/HSE, dated 13 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as 'grey & white uPVC double glazed conservatory on a first floor balcony to the rear elevation of a private dwelling'.
- 

### 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 surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The proposal would create a conservatory that would enclose the rear balcony at first floor level at the appeal site, which is located at the end of a terrace of similar dwellings. I accept that the development would not be widely visible within the area. However, on my site visit, I saw that the rear elevations of the appeal site and its neighbours are visible from the car parking area at the southern end of the terrace.
4. From this vantage point, I saw that these contemporary dwellings are almost identical in design, each with an existing balcony at the rear on the first floor. Notwithstanding some small differences in detail, the terrace retains a strong rhythm and uniformity of style that contributes positively to the quality and character of the area.
5. The Council's document entitled 'Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance' (SPD) sets out design principles for residential extensions. It states that if there is a consistent and coherent architectural character, then a new extension should not detract from it. The extension should sit comfortably with the main building and with neighbouring houses by taking account of the group value, character and established form of development.

6. In this case, the proposal would add volume at the first floor level which would not be characteristic of the remainder of the terrace. The glazed panels of the new conservatory would accentuate the bulk of the alteration, and would be visually incongruous in this location. The scheme would undermine the essential harmony and simplicity of the succession of balconies as architectural elements within the overall composition of the rear elevations of the terrace. I saw no other examples of such developments within the terrace.
7. I accept that the development would be constructed to match the existing frames, colour and style of No 18, and I agree that there is already plenty of glazing within the design of the building, at the front and back. However, these circumstances would not overcome my concerns about the visual impact of the proposal. I have taken into account the letter that has been received in support of the proposal, but this has not led me to a different conclusion.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would thus conflict with Policy CS1 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS), which amongst other things seeks the highest standards of urban design, and CS Policy CS5, insofar as it aims to ensure that development in Barnet respects local context. The proposal would also conflict with Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DMP), insofar as it requires that all development should represent high quality design. Finally, it would fail to comply with the advice given in the SPD.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Elaine Gray*

INSPECTOR