
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/19/3242664
106 East Barnet Road, Barnet EN4 8RE

- 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 KCH Contractors against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
The application Ref 19/5113/FUL, dated 17 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the addition of second floor to create 1 no self-contained flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The prevailing scale of development in the area closest to the appeal site is two storey, or two storey with accommodation built into roof spaces. Little separation is afforded between the existing buildings which means that their relative heights and massing are important in defining the street scene along this section of East Barnet Road. Overall, the general consistency in the height and massing of the buildings and their relationship to one another forms an important visual component of the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposed development would introduce an extra storey to the appeal property, resulting in a three storey building with a gable facing towards the public highway. The height and massing of the resultant building would be at odds with its surroundings and it would appear as an alien and incongruous feature, owing to its substantially greater height and bulk than those of the buildings which form the street scene in which it sits. This would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The rear of the proposal would be less prominent from the public domain, although glimpses of it would be possible from Edward Road. Nonetheless, the proposal would have much the same effect to the rear, in that it would represent a development that would be out of scale in the surroundings in which it would sit. The impact would be less as this elevation is not as

prominent, but it would still contribute to the overall harm that would be caused by the proposed development.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area by reason of its height and massing. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to accord with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies 2012 (DMP), where they seek to safeguard character and appearance. There would also be conflict with the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 which seeks to achieve the same aims.

Other Matters

7. The proposal would contribute to the supply of housing of different sizes in the borough, which is an aim of Policy DM08 of the DMP. However, this consideration does not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR