The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSC (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3241170

9 Lanzerac House, Latimer Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 5NU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Askew against the decision of London Borough of Barnet Council.
- The application Ref 19/3061/HSE dated 29 May 2019 was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
- The development proposed is a first floor extension over existing garage and utility room.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of The Monken Hadley Conservation Area (Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. In line with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, considerable importance and weight must be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

5. The appeal site is a detached two storey property situated on the northern side of Latimer Road. It consists of a hipped roof and a gable roof with the gable end wall protruding further out from the front elevation. There is a single storey side flat roof garage which is setback from the main elevation and, due to its low-key design, it does not detract from the roofscape of the two-storey element of the appeal house. The surrounding area comprises of various designs and first-floor extensions did not appear to be prevalent in the immediate area. The various styles of properties witnessed do not provide a strong sense of uniformity, however, this is not the case for the appeal property and its immediate neighbour. The neighbouring house to the west, 8

Alona House, is set more forward than the appeal site but is generally very similar in design and mirrors the appeal dwelling. These two properties can clearly be seen from the street scene. Although there is some screening from trees, this does not diminish the positive, symmetrical, relationship No.9 and No.8 share. Overall, the strong uniformity the appeal site and No.8 share contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, regardless of when the houses were built.

6. The proposed first floor side extension would not relate well to the site context, even with matching materials. The additional mass would unbalance the design it shares with 8 Alona House, detracting from the balance and uniformity to the detriment of the street scene. This combined with the new roofline, even though it would be set lower than the host dwelling, would detract from the original character of the appeal dwelling. Furthermore, the proposal would be at odds with the local vicinity where first floor side extensions are not a characteristic feature. The proposed development would therefore appear to be an incongruous form of development when viewed from the street scene.

7. The Council's Officer report makes reference to the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Officer report states the proposed first floor side extension would meet the criteria of the SPD by virtue of the setback from the front elevation, its width compared to that of the original dwelling and the set in from the flank wall of No.8. However, it would not sit comfortably with the main building and detract from the coherent architectural character. As such, despite compliance with aspects of the SPD, as described within the Council's Officer report, the development would still result in harm.

8. For these reasons, I conclude the development would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Monken Hadley Conservation Area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policies DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies, September 2012, which seeks to protect the character and appearance of an area and protect Conservation Areas respectively. The proposal would further conflict with Policies CS1 and CS NPPF of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy, September 2012, which seeks to ensure highest standards of urban design and sustainable development respectively.

9. The harm to the Conservation Area would be less than substantial as it would only be seen from a small part of the Conservation Area. However, no public benefits have been put forward against which this harm could be weighed.

Other Matters

10. The appellant makes comparison against a previous planning application (B/04725/13) and state that the Council's reasons for refusal differ to the appeal application and is contradictory. I do not have full details of this scheme and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. Notwithstanding this, the appellant and the Council state this application was withdrawn and therefore no formal decision would have been made by the Council. In any case I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

11. The appellant raised concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application in terms of delays and previous advice given. However, this is a

separate matter and does not affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal.

12. I note the supporting comments of neighbours and that there would be no significant impact on living conditions for neighbouring occupiers. However, these are neutral factors that would not outweigh the identified harm.

13. The appellant's reasons for the proposed development is with regards to a child with special needs. Given that the proposal would provide respite to the main carers, I attach a considerable amount of weight to this personal circumstance. However, as stated above, the duty imposed on me in respect of the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area is a matter of considerable importance and weight. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework requires that great weight be given to the conservation of the heritage asset. Whilst I sympathise with the appellants, given all the matters raised above, this personal circumstance would not outweigh the harm the development represents.

Recommendation and Conclusion

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

Mariam Noorgat

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.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR