



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3241578

22 Netherlands Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Bamford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 19/4192/HSE, dated 30 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a Pergola over rear patio.
-

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 host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area. It is situated at the south-eastern corner of a 'block' of residential development which is bounded by Netherlands Road, Calton Road, Monks Avenue and Longmore Avenue. The site is a corner plot at the junction of Netherlands Road and Calton Road.
4. From what I saw during my site visit and the aerial view, extensions to dwellings - in particular ground floor and dormer extensions to the rear - are not uncommon in the area. Nevertheless, the area of residential development in the vicinity of the site is characterised by semi-detached dwelling pairs, which are noticeably rectangular in their original core shape. The prevalent building materials are pebble dash and brick facing, red roof tiles or grey tiles and slates. As such, whilst there is some variety in the mix of materials and extensions to dwellings, the above factors together result in a noticeably cohesive, core suburban character to the area. Within this context, the existing dwelling appears to have a relatively larger quantity and mass of extensions, given its combination of dormer, conservatory and other single-storey rear and two-storey side extensions.
5. An aluminium pergola frame with louvred roof is proposed to the rear of the host building. It would be approximately 7m wide, 2.9m deep and 3m high.

6. The rising topography of the western end of Calton Rd would contribute to the visibility of the proposal, travelling down from that end of the road. As such, the upper part of the proposed aluminium pergola would be noticeable, viewed from the street on Calton Rd, approaching in an easterly direction. The pergola would also be noticeable from upper windows of some dwellings towards the eastern end of Calton Road. The views of the proposed pergola described above would not be precluded by the presence of the site's garden boundary wall.
7. Together with the existing rear extension, the proposal would amount to a combined depth of approximately 5.9m. In combination with the previous multiple extensions, the proposal would result in an accumulation of bulk and mass, which would be noticeable from the viewpoints described above. As such, the proposal would visually detract from the noticeable, cohesive original character of broadly rectangular pairs of semi-detached dwellings.
8. Furthermore, the cumulative depth would substantially exceed the normal depth threshold of 3.5m for rear extensions to semi-detached properties, set out in paragraph 14.21 of the London Borough of Barnet's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016) (RDG). The RDG sets out that extensions should normally be subordinate to the original house, respect the original building and not be overly dominant.
9. Aluminium does not appear to be a noticeably prevalent residential building material in the vicinity of the site. Due to its location to the west of the host building, on bright days the proposed aluminium louvred roof and frame of the structure would be likely to catch the sun from late morning onwards. This would further draw attention to the structure.
10. Given the above, the proposal would - in combination with existing extensions - result in a visually incongruous addition to the dwelling, and a noticeably disproportionate mass and bulk, which would be discordant with the host dwelling and the character of the area.
11. I recognise that the proposed pergola is not an enclosed building, and the bulk of the garden space would be unaltered. I note the appellant's view that the proposal would be a subservient addition to the property and not be readily noticeable within the area.
12. However, for the reasons described above, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy CS5 of the London Borough of Barnet's Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM01 of the London Borough of Barnet's Development Management Policies (2012), and guidance in paragraph 14.21 of the RDG. Together, the policies and guidance seek to ensure that development complements local character.

Other Matters

13. The proposal would enable more flexible use of part of the rear garden. However, this would not be a benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

William Cooper INSPECTOR