



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

**by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3239176**

**6 Grimsdyke Crescent, Barnet EN5 4AG**

- 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 Mr D Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref: 19/4337/HSE, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is two storey rear, two storey side and single storey front extensions.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for two storey rear, two storey side and single storey front extensions at 6 Grimsdyke Crescent, Barnet EN5 4AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/4337/HSE, dated 5 August 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Block Plan; 3028/1; 3028/2; 3028/3; 3028/4; 3028/5; 3028/6; and 3028/7.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. 3028/7.

### Procedural matter

2. The decision notice issued by the Council described the proposed development as 'Single storey front, two storey side and rear extensions following demolition of the existing conservatory. Insertion of 2no rooflights in rear roofslope'. Whilst this adds to the description from the planning application form, the application form adequately and accurately sets out the development that is proposed and I have, therefore, retained that description for the purposes of the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal building is a substantial detached house, set in a relatively large plot. It is neither a listed building, nor is it within a conservation area. The appeal building is located in a residential area comprising predominantly two storey, detached and semi-detached, houses with smaller numbers of bungalows. The surrounding area is architecturally diverse, although the similar age of most of the houses and some common features such as bay windows, the use of render and brickwork, similar window proportions, and similar solid to void ratios impart a degree of homogeneity. Nonetheless, there are a wide range of external appearances and roof forms within the immediate surroundings. The appeal building is unusual in the area due to the use of arched head windows on the ground floor front elevation that are symmetrically arranged each side of the centrally placed front door with a Venetian, or Palladian, window above at first floor level. The symmetry of the original front façade has, however, been much diluted by the past addition of a large side extension comprising a double garage with an extensive, half hipped, roof containing a pitched roof dormer window.
5. When read together, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (the London Plan), Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy) and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies 2012 (DMDPD) expect new development to be of a high standard of design that has regard to its context and complements the local architectural character, taking account of the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of the surrounding buildings. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (the SPD) provides more detailed design guidance in respect of extensions to houses and is to be read alongside the more general design policies in the development plan.
6. The SPD states that side extensions should not be more than half the width of the original house and that first floor side extensions should normally be set back 1 metre from the main front wall of the existing house. It also sets out that side extensions should be located 1 metre from a common boundary with a neighbouring property. The appeal proposal would not exceed half the width of the original house and it is not in dispute that the proposed two storey side extension would be set away from the common boundary to either side by at least 1 metre. The proposal does not incorporate a 1 metre set back at first floor level, however, the SPD is guidance only and is not prescriptive. The proposed extension would maintain the same ridge and eaves line as the original main house, and it is also proposed to adjust the window forms and the positioning of the openings on the front elevation. The visual effect of this would result in a balanced façade that is in proportion with the existing large extension to the opposite side. Consequently, the proposed extension would not over-dominate the existing building, nor would it result in a terracing effect between neighbouring properties.
7. The proposed side extension would alter the visual relationship between the appeal building and the neighbouring property at number 4. Nonetheless, I saw during my site visit that in the surrounding area, the spacing between dwellings is not regular and it was also clear from my site visit that, as pointed out by the appellant, other properties in the street have been extended to the side in the past. Taking into account all of the above, I find that the proposed side extension would have a broadly neutral effect on the street scene.

8. The Council do not object to the ground floor element of the proposed rear extension. The proposed first floor element would project the same distance from the original rear elevation as the ground floor extension. The side elevations of the proposed extension would be rendered to match the existing house, whilst the rear elevation would be faced in brickwork. The Council has not objected to the size of the rear extension on the grounds that it would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring houses, and only object to its visual effect on the area. The rear extension would not be readily visible from Grimsdyke Crescent and although it would be visible at a distance from houses to the rear, it would be partly screened by mature trees within the rear garden areas. The existing rear elevation of the house has a mix of window sizes and shapes that, whilst they reflect the uses and disposition of the internal spaces within the house, do not result in a distinguished elevation of any real architectural interest. The rear elevation of the proposed extension would have a well ordered composition and a fenestration pattern that is not, in itself, inherently objectionable. When I visited the site and the surrounding area, I observed that many of the properties have a mixture of render and brickwork on the elevations.
9. The proposed rear extension would result in the loss of part of the previous side extension that projects beyond the rear of the original house. Both parties state that this is a later addition to the original house. Although it adds some three dimensional form to the current dwelling, as a later addition it is not a fundamental part of the character of the house and I do not find that harm would be caused to the wider area or the character of the existing house by the loss of either this element of the building, or the dilapidated conservatory that is located on the opposite side of the rear elevation.
10. Due to the depth of the proposed rear extension, the original hipped and half hipped roofs would be converted to crown roofs with a flat central section. However, this would not increase the perceived ridge height and I saw when I visited the site that there are other examples of this type of roof in the area, notably on Galley Lane immediately to the south of the appeal building.
11. The Council has not raised objections to the ground floor front extension, which amounts to a canopy over the main entrance door supported on two columns. Nor has the Council raised objections to the alterations to the windows on the front elevation to replace the arch headed ground floor windows and first floor Venetian window with simpler, square headed, windows. From what I have read and from what I saw when I visited the site, I have no reason to disagree with this, as I have not been made aware of any policy requirements that restrict the alteration of window openings, and the style and size of the windows would be consistent with others in the area.
12. Although the proposed extensions would be quite large, like many other houses in the area, the existing house is substantial and is sited in an extensive plot. The proposed extension would be in proportion with the existing house and its curtilage. This, combined with the limited visibility of much of the proposed works from the public domain, would result in the proposed extensions, taken as a whole, having no overall adverse effect.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with the relevant requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Core Strategy Policies

CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM01 of the DMDPD. It would also comply broadly with the advice in the SPD.

### **Conditions**

14. I have had regard to the conditions that have been suggested by the Council. In order to provide certainty in respect of what has been granted planning permission, I have attached condition specifying the approved drawings. The Council has suggested a condition requiring that the materials to be used on the extensions match those of the existing building. In the interests of the appearance of the building, it is necessary that the new materials match, particularly on the front and side elevations. The submitted drawings are annotated to state that much of the proposed extensions will be rendered to match the existing building. However, they also indicate that the rear elevation is to be finished in a red engineering brick from a specified manufacturer. I have found that this would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and consequently I have attached a condition requiring the extension to be constructed using the materials specified on the approved drawings.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*John Dowsett*

INSPECTOR