
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/19/3242912

28 Parkside Gardens, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 8JR

- 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 Agim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/1590/FUL, dated 15 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of existing outbuilding at land adjacent to 28 Parkside Garden, East Barnet EN4 8JR and erection a new single family dwelling with basement and habitable room in the loft with associated amenity space, parking, bin & cycle store.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the side and part of the rear garden to No 28 Parkside Gardens which is a corner plot at the junction of Ferney Road. It is a narrow rectangular land parcel which currently contains a detached outbuilding. It is fenced at its boundary with Parkside Gardens to the front and Ferney Road to the side. The existing dwelling is one half of a pair of semi detached dwellings set back from and facing the road with a defined gap between its side elevation and Ferney Road. There is a further pair sat line abreast the appeal site which abuts the rear gardens of dwellings that face Brookside Street. There are two terraces of three dwellings also facing Parkside Gardens, to the opposite side of Ferney Road. There is therefore something of an even rhythm to the street scene and the sense of spaciousness at the Ferney Road junction garnered from the siting of No 28 is reflected in the gap between Ferney Road and the side elevation of the dwelling opposite. Parkside Gardens is on a relatively steep incline running from East Walk, north eastward to Brookside Street.
4. The appeal scheme seeks the addition of a dwelling to the side of No 28, attached to it, which would form a terrace. Whilst the addition of a gable roof to No 28 has reduced the symmetry of the original pair, the attachment of another dwelling to form a terrace would further unbalance the appearance of

the buildings and fail to correspond to the adjacent pair further up the hill. There are two terraces of three in the same street scene but these are read as distinct in design and layout terms to the defined two pairs between Ferney Road and Brookside Street given how Ferney Road itself intervenes.

5. The land drops steeply away towards Ferney Road. As such, the proposed dwelling would appear overly tall and whilst not dissimilar in overall width to No 28, its height would emphasise its apparent narrow and squeezed design. This would jar with the two buildings to which it would be attached. It would fill the space to the side of No 28, crowding the corner at the junction with Ferney Road and accordingly reducing the aforementioned spacious feel. I appreciate there is a detached outbuilding of size on the site of the proposed dwelling which does reduce somewhat the spaciousness, but this is low level and largely hidden from views due to boundary treatment. A two storey dwelling with rooms in the roof space would be fundamentally different in its effect. Mainly due to its scale and mass.
6. There is a defined set back to dwellings that face Ferney Road. That set back is roughly in line with the side elevation of No 28 as it stands. The addition of a dwelling on the appeal site would sit significantly proud of what is a character forming uniform building line to Ferney Road. It would appear obvious and discordant in this street scene. An impact exacerbated by its proposed height, particularly in views along Ferney Road, towards Parkside Gardens.
7. With the above in mind, the appeal scheme would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Such that it would conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016, DM01 of the Local Plan¹ and CS4 and CS5 of the Core Strategy². Amongst other things and along with section 12 of the Framework³, these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality, has regard to the form, function and structure of an area, is based on an understanding of local characteristics, does not undermine suburban character or local distinctiveness and respects local context.
8. The proposed development would also be contrary to the objectives of the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD⁴. In regard to this main issue, this document advocates the use of good design that enhances local character and has regard to scale, massing, height and building lines amongst other things. The Council also refer to their Sustainable Design and Construction SPD⁵. However, this seems to be more related to how a design may work in regard to, amongst other things, accessibility, energy usage, resource management and environmental impact. It does not therefore strike me as immediately relevant to the contentious matters in this appeal.

Other Matters

9. The appeal scheme would not harm the living conditions of either future occupiers or those of existing neighbours. These are some of several areas in which the proposed dwelling would be acceptable and comply with the development plan. In each case however, these matters would represent a

¹ Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012

² Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012

³ The National Planning Policy Framework 2019

⁴ Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016

⁵ Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Sustainable Design and Construction 2016

lack of harm and thus, by definition, be incapable of weighing against it. My conclusions are therefore unchanged.

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to what is now known as No 55 Knoll Drive, a short distance from the appeal site. This appears to be a dwelling that was erected beside the last house on the street, occupying what would have been a spacious corner plot to No 53. I have been able to see this dwelling and whilst I was not party to the circumstances of the case that granted a planning permission for it, it is a detached unit, maintains a gap between it and No 53 (which is also detached) and does not appear to disrupt another street scene (Monkfrith Way). In design, scale and appearance terms it fits well within the Knoll Drive street scene. I am not therefore satisfied it bears sufficient similarities with the appeal site such that I would be minded to allow the appeal in its light.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons I have explained, and whilst having regard to other matters that have been raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR