
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: 19th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3238977

8 County Gate, Barnet EN5 1EH

- 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 Hideichi Miyazaki against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 19/4226/HSE, dated 31 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, roof extension involving rear dormer window and 3 no. front facing rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal form and decision notice, as it more fully reflects the proposal than that shown on the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace property within a row of four terraced dwellings. The area is characterised by rows of four and five terraced dwellings, which are typically separated by approximately car-width gaps, set on fairly straight residential streets that lead off the western side of Great North Road.
5. A noticeable number of other end of terrace dwellings along County Gate in the vicinity of the appeal property, as cited by the appellant, have two-storey side extensions of various forms which stretch to their side boundaries. This adds a layer of architectural diversity to the sense of relative core, twentieth century suburban homogeneity in the area. Within this context, the proposed side extension would not appear discordantly out of place, viewed from the street at the front of the property.
6. A minimum 1m gap between extension and boundary, as stated in paragraph 14.17 of the London Borough of Barnet's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (RDG), would not be achieved.

However, the RDG's 'normal' minimum gap of 2m between the flank walls of neighbouring properties at first floor level would be achieved. Moreover, the front view of the proposal would assimilate acceptably into the streetscene, as described above.

7. However, to the rear of the property, the accumulation of the proposed large dormer - which at 5.2m wide and to ridge height, would stretch almost the whole of the width of the two-storey core of the appeal building - along with the proposed two-storey side extension and substantial existing single-storey extension, would appear as disproportionate bulk. In combination, this would visually over-dominate the host terraced dwelling and row. Furthermore, the dormer, in combination with the proposed two-storey side extension would visually 'loom up' discordantly.
8. The stretch of County Gate including the appeal property is characterised by rear garden topography which slopes up to rows of dwellings, that are set in a fairly straight line. Within this context, the discordant impact described above would be visible from the rear garden of the appeal site, other rear gardens in the vicinity, and the access track to garages which runs down the side of the appeal property.
9. The above discordant effects would conflict with the following design guidance in paragraph 14.33 of the RDG: the rear dormer would not be a subordinate feature on the roof; the dormer would exceed half the width and half the depth of the existing, and proposed, roof slope; and adequate roof slope around the dormer would not be achieved.
10. In conclusion the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the host dwelling. As such, it would conflict with Policies CS1 and 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 Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016)¹. Together, the policies seek to ensure that development complements local character.

Other Matters

11. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation at the appeal site. However, this would not be a significant public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

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

William Cooper

INSPECTOR

¹ The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2011, March 2016.