



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/19/3232805

3 Kings Street Mews, London N2 8EQ

- 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 Pryce Properties against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/1861/FUL, dated 27 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a new mansard roof replacing existing pitched roof to form a new 1 bed flat and repositioning of bedroom to existing flat 3.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - (i) Whether or not the development would lead to an increase in demand for on-street parking; and
 - (ii) The effect a new mansard roof would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end terrace, three-storey building that has previously been converted from light industrial use into 4 self-contained flats. It is situated in King Street Mews, a cul-de-sac off Kings Street within the East Finchley area. This street consists of a mix of buildings in either residential or commercial use. There is a small parking area to the side of the appeal property for existing residents.
4. The proposal is to create an additional one-bed, self-contained flat within the existing roofspace. This would be achieved by a vertical extension, converting the hipped to a mansard roof, with new dormer windows in all elevations. This new roof would also increase the bedroom size of the existing flat No 3.

Parking

5. Policy DM17 of the Development Management Policies¹ requires a one bedroom flat to provide one to less than one parking space. However, it also states that residential development may be acceptable with limited or no parking outside a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), but only where it can be demonstrated through a parking survey that there is sufficient on-street parking capacity.

¹ Barnet's Local Plan, Development Management Policies, Development Plan Document, September 2012.

6. This proposal would provide no on-site parking, it would be outside of a CPZ and has provided little evidence to justify that this development would not increase the demand for on-street parking. It was evident from my site visit that the availability of on-street parking in the local area was already at capacity. Therefore, in the absence of a parking survey, this proposal does not satisfactorily address the issue of future car owning occupiers and resident car parking.
7. Furthermore, the low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score, indicates that access to public transport was limited in this area. I acknowledge that it would be a short walk to High Road where there is a public bus route, but no indication of the level and frequency of service has been provided. I also noted that small convenience stores were in the vicinity, but these were unlikely to provide all the necessities for future residents. Therefore, transport out of the local area would be required at times.
8. On the basis of what I have seen and read, I conclude that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable increase in demand for on-street parking. Consequently, this proposal would not comply with policy DM17 of the Development Management Policies and the Residential Design Guidance². This policy and guidance requires development to follow appropriate parking standards or submit evidence to justify reduced parking provision.
9. The Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document³ was also referenced in the reason for refusal on this matter. However, this contains little reference to parking standards and therefore has not been determinative in my consideration of the proposal.

Character and Appearance

10. This building is situated in a cul-de-sac, within a slight dip and not freely visible from the surrounding streets. Only fleeting and oblique glimpses of the property are afforded to passers-by. The property is surrounded by a mix of commercial and residential properties. These have a wide variety of designs, scale and mass, which include mansard roofs and four-storey buildings. Therefore, this development would not be an incongruous or dominant addition to the local area.
11. Furthermore, while the proposed mansard roof would lead to an increase in pitch and mass, the overall height of the building would not increase. The new mansard roof and dormer windows would also be constructed sympathetically to complement the host property and surrounding buildings, enabling it to blend in with the neighbouring structures.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. Consequently, the development would comply with policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Core Strategy⁴, policy 7.4 of the London Plan⁵, policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies and the Adopted Residential Design Guidance.

² Barnet London Borough, Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guidance, October 2016

³ Barnet London Borough, Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Document, Sustainable Design and Construction, October 2016.

⁴ Barnet London Borough, Barnet's Local Plan, Core Strategy, Development Plan Document, September 2012.

⁵ The London Plan, March 2015

Conclusion

13. Notwithstanding my conclusions in relation to character and appearance, I conclude that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable increase in demand for on-street parking. The overriding consideration is the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole in respect of parking management.
14. Although I have not upheld all the Council's reasons for refusal detailed above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hilton-Brown

INSPECTOR