
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by R Lankshear BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3233941

39 Edgeworth Crescent, Hendon, London NW4 4HA

- 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 P Halai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/1588/HSE, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed double storey rear extension, double storey side extension, loft conversion and conversion of garage into habitable room and associated internal alterations at 39 Edgeworth Crescent, Hendon, NW4 4HA'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3233943) on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling within a predominantly residential area. The dwelling is situated on the outside of a bend in the road in an elevated position compared to properties to the west, resulting in a wider and more visible plot than generally observed within the street scene. The property sits at the end of a row of similarly designed and proportioned properties and whilst there is some degree of variety in terms of house design, the street scene largely comprises of hipped roofed two storey dwellings.
5. The development proposed would introduce a first floor side extension to the east of the dwelling; a part single, part two storey side extension to the west; a part single, part two storey rear extension; one rear dormer and two rooflights within the front elevation. The two storey side extensions would both be setback from the respective parts of the host property, although the ridge of the dwelling would be increased in height and extended as a result of the works.

6. Cumulatively the proposed extensions would significantly increase the width of the house when viewed from the road. The alterations considered together would also create an increasingly wide and bulky roof form that would accentuate the additional massing of the building as a result of the extensions. By virtue of their scale and bulk the proposal when considered as a whole, does not represent a subservient addition to the host property, resulting in a conspicuously bulky dwelling that would be out of keeping with the appearance and form of the predominant character of the street scene. Furthermore, the appeal site sits in a prominent position within the street scene visible on approach from the west. Owing to its prominence and proposed significant increase in size, the proposal would extend across the majority of the frontage of the site and diminish its existing open nature that currently contributes positively to the character of the area.
7. For these reasons the proposal would appear as an incongruous and disproportionate addition that fails to respect the design and scale of the host dwelling, representing an inappropriate and bulky design that would not be acceptable in its context.
8. I acknowledge that the first floor side extensions would be set in from the boundary and setback from the front of the dwelling as suggested within the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD) and that the proposed extensions to the rear would not be overly visible from Edgeworth Crescent. The appellant also contends that appropriate matching materials would be used and the front bay retained. Whilst I acknowledge these points, they do not adequately mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area caused by the cumulative scale of the appeal proposal, as detailed above.
9. The appellant contends that there are a number of substantial properties with wide frontages and as such the proposal would not be out of keeping in this context. Nevertheless, from the details that are before me and from my site observations, it appears that the constraints and position of the sites detailed are somewhat different to the appeal site and are not commonplace. In any event, each case must be assessed on its individual planning merits and I consider that having regard to the individual context of the appeal development, owing to their cumulative scale and prominence, the proposal would be incongruous and visually discordant with the host property and immediate street scene.
10. I conclude that the appeal development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such it would be contrary to the character and appearance aims of policies CS1 and CS5 of the adopted Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012; policy DM01 of the adopted Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), that seek, amongst other things, that development should represent high quality design and should preserve or enhance local character; the National Planning Policy Framework, including the design aims of paragraph 127, and the guidance contained within the adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD 2016.

Other Matters

11. The appellant contends that no objections were received to the planning application with regard to design of the proposal and that the Council did not find harm with regard to living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding this and noting the comments raised, these matters do not alter or outweigh my conclusion with regard to the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Lankshear

INSPECTOR