



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3238863

12 Lincoln Avenue, Southgate, London N14 7LG

- 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 Dr Alfred Besong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/3914/HSE, dated 15 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2019.
 - The proposed development is part single, part two storey rear extension. New front porch. Roof extension involving a hip to gable and a rear dormer window and 2no front facing rooflights. New rear outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. For conciseness and precision, the description of the proposed development set out above has been taken from the decision notice instead of the application form.
4. During my site visit, I observed that the appeal property had been subject to a hip-to-gable roof extension. Two rooflights have been installed within the front roofslope, although their positioning is different to what is shown on the proposed drawings. A large dormer extension has also been built within the rear roofslope, although it is also different to what is shown on the proposed drawings in terms of its materiality, fenestration and design. The appeal property is therefore significantly different in appearance to how it is shown within the existing plans and elevations submitted as part of the application. Regardless, this appeal can still be determined insofar as it relates to the proposed drawings.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Lincoln Avenue. The surrounding streetscene is characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellinghouses, with several properties having been subject to hip-to-gable roof and rear dormer extensions.
7. The proposed dormer extension would not be set back from the sides of the house, the ridge or eaves and would occupy the whole of the existing rear roof slope. It would therefore appear as an overly dominant and incongruous addition. Also, as it would introduce an obtrusive brick face at roof-level that would contrast poorly with the hipped roofs and more modestly sized dormer extensions of neighbouring properties, the proposed dormer would appear especially incongruous in relation to the character of the appeal property and surrounding area. Furthermore, in combination with the proposed hip-to-gable extension and the side-facing window of the proposed loft floor, the proposed dormer would result in the appearance of a three-storey property as its brick façade would blend in seamlessly with the proposed gable-ended side elevation. Also, although the ground floor element of the proposed rear extension would have an acceptably subordinate relationship to the appeal property, the first-floor element, when seen alongside the proposed works at roof-level, would further undermine the proportions of the original dwellinghouse and appear as an insubordinate and bulky addition.
8. Turning to the proposed porch, properties along Lincoln Avenue are not characterised by neoclassical-style architectural features such as columns. Consequently, the design of the proposed front porch would appear particularly discordant when seen within the street. Additionally, as the porch would extend from the bay window across to the flank wall, would protrude beyond the depth of the bay window by approximately 1m and its height would be set approximately only 300mm under the cill of the first floor window above, the proposed front porch would appear as a large and overly dominant feature within the front elevation and would relate poorly with the character and proportions of the appeal property, as well as the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene.
9. Furthermore, while the Council potentially have concerns with regard to the height above ground level of the outbuilding within the sloping rear garden, I nevertheless consider that due to its position within the centre of the garden, it would appear as an incongruous addition in the context of the largely undeveloped neighbouring gardens.
10. The appellant states that the proposed loft extension and outbuilding could be done under permitted development rights. Indeed, the works already carried out at the appeal site may be permitted development. However, this has not been satisfactorily demonstrated and so I have solely considered the proposal for which planning permission was sought as shown in the submitted drawings.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) (2012), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) (2012) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which broadly state that development should be designed to the highest standards and respond

positively to local character. The proposal would also conflict with the Residential Design Guide SPD (2016), which requires that residential extensions should appear subordinate to the original house.

Other Matters

12. I understand that the appellant initially sought pre-application advice from the Council, where no issues were raised by the Council regarding the design of the proposed front porch, first floor rear extension and outbuilding. While I have some sympathy for the appellant, this does not provide justification for these elements of the proposal which would cause unacceptable harm for reasons set out above.
13. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties along Lincoln Avenue where similar development has been carried out. Within Exhibit C of the appellant's statement, photographs of properties with hip-to-gable roof rear dormer extensions and front porches are shown. However, the porches appear more discrete, the rear dormers do not appear to extend the full depth and width of their rear roofslopes, and they are built of more appropriate materials than the brick shown within the submitted plans. In any case, each appeal must be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR