



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3255065

122 The Vale, Childs Hill, London NW11 8SL

- 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 Mrs Lydia Zilkha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/0820/HSE, dated 14 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension to existing dwelling including associated changes to roof.
-

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 comprises a two storey dwelling set back from and facing the road. It occupies a corner plot at the junction of The Vale and Greenfield Gardens. The two storey dwellings that line the southern side of The Vale are linked by ground floor flat roofed garages and thus form a terrace albeit they are viewed in street scene terms as pairs of semi detached units. The area is residential in character and whilst designs vary in the wider area there is a relatively even rhythm to property type and appearance on the south side of the Vale in and around the appeal site. Indeed, the appeal building and its adjoined neighbour are close to symmetrical from the front with a shallow hipped roof, matching openings and forward projecting two storey bay window features. They are largely unaltered in this respect, save for a flat roof porch on the former.
4. The building has been extended out to the rear previously, over two storeys. An extension that steps out to the side. The alterations are visible from Greenfield Gardens. The appeal scheme would bring a single storey section out to the side, to abut the back edge of the footway at Greenfield Gardens. This would wrap around the existing building, enlarging the ground floor at the rear. It would have a flat roof. The existing two storey rear projection would move further out towards Greenfield Gardens.

5. The new additions would increase the amount of extensions to the existing dwelling, creating a considerably larger building. The increase in mass would have a noticeable unbalancing effect on the pair, making it appear lop sided, mainly due to the extent of its projection, at ground and first floor, towards Greenfield Gardens. Whilst appearing subservient in height terms, the bulk of the new extensions would not appear so in terms of their cumulative size. In addition, the use of a continuous flat roof around the side and projecting out to the rear would fail to respect the form and design of the host dwelling. Whilst I note flat roofs have been used previously on historic alterations to the dwelling, I do not feel this is a sufficient justification to deploy them further.
6. I have seen some revised plans that show the use of barn hips to the roof as it would project to the side and rear and whilst this would reduce the mass of the extensions to some degree I do not consider it would be sufficient to make them acceptable. In any case, and in regard to the design of the original building, such features would appear contrived. The use of appropriate external materials, compatible with the host dwelling would be welcome in the scheme but in this case they would not be enough to sufficient reduce the harm that I have found. I am also mindful of the fact that there would be a general expectation of a suitable external material for an extension scheme to be acceptable in any event.
7. For these reasons, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Such that it would conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD¹ and Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD². These policies seek, amongst other things, the highest standards of urban design, ensure new development respects local context and character and it is based on an understanding of local characteristics.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012

² Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012