The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/20/3253684
47 The Greenway, Colindale, London NW9 5AU

- 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 Ms Latipha Hamdoun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
- The application Ref 19/6826/FUL, dated 19 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2020.
- The development proposed is construction of two-storey dwellinghouse to the side of No47 The Greenway with associated car parking and refuse storage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling located on The Greenway. It is situated on a corner, with Greenway Gardens running along the side and rear of the site, as such it is a visually prominent part of the street scene. The property has garden space to the front, side and rear, which gives the site an open and spacious character. The surrounding area is predominately residential and is characterised by semi-detached dwellings, which front onto the road and have relatively long rear gardens.

4. Despite the slight variations to the properties along the road, The Greenway is mainly characterised by semi-detached pairs, which gives the street scene a sense of uniformity and rhythm. The properties located on the corners of the junctions, generally have large and wide garden spaces, which creates an open and spacious character in these areas.

5. The proposal would introduce a new 2 storey dwelling to the side of the host property, with rooms in the roof space and associated parking and refuse storage. The proposed dwelling would have a pitched roof at first floor level with a flat roof at ground floor level at the rear. The proposal would also incorporate a hip-to-gable conversion to the roof of the host property, which the roof of the new dwelling would adjoin to.

6. Due to the scale, size and design of the proposed two-storey dwelling, it would largely fill the gap that currently exists to the side of the host property and would unbalance the rhythm of the street scene. The additional width of the proposal,

along with the introduction of an additional door to the front elevation and the changes to the roof of the host property, would unbalance the design of the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings. As such, it would be an incongruous and stark addition within the street scene.

7. The appellants have suggested that the principle of built form on this site has already been considered acceptable through previous planning decisions and an appeal[1]. However, the current proposal is materially different to the previous approved schemes, in that it is significantly wider and has an increased mass, as well as the changes to the roof design. Whilst I note that the appellant has sought to create a development which would be sympathetic to the host property and other properties in the street, the proposed changes would be at odds with the existing character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

8. I note that a number of properties across the wider area have been extended or altered in various ways, which the appellant has provided photographs of. Nevertheless, the gaps which exist between the semi-detached properties in the area are generally maintained at the first floor level. These gaps create a relatively even spacing between the properties and a uniformity to the street scene. Whilst, extensions are noticeable in the area, this proposal is not comparable as it appears as a separate dwelling and encompasses a mixed roof design and an additional door to the front elevation.

9. Furthermore, I do not have full details of the planning status of all these examples, or what may have led to their approval. In any case, proposals must be determined on their own planning merits and within their own immediate context, which is what I have done.

10. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the adopted Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016). These policies and guidance collectively seek, amongst other things, for new development to be high quality and to respect the local character of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. I note that the appellant has outlined that the proposal would incorporate first floor refuge space in the event of a flood and that it would provide an additional family home for the area. However, these factors would not overcome the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

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

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR

[1] 17/3884/HSE, 18/1148/FUL, APP/N5090/W/18/3207389