



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3256820

228 Golders Green Road, Golders Green, London NW11 9AT

- 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 S Denciger against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/0190/HSE, dated 9 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is Ground floor rear extension and first floor infill side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal property was undergoing significant renovation at the time of my visit with a large, single storey rear extension under construction.
3. From my site visit inspection, I note that the submitted plans of the existing dwelling, save for the front elevation, do not precisely accord with the plans before me. Nevertheless, I have considered the proposal based on the plans before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is semi-detached and located on the north eastern side of Golders Green Road set within a street scene of other similarly designed dwellings on this side of the road.
6. The proposal is to extend the rear elevation at ground floor and to extend the width of the first-floor rear bedroom via an infill to the outrigger to meet the existing side wall above part of the projecting single storey rear extension. Although, as a combination of development, it would substantially add bulk to the dwelling, the Council's delegated report explains that the proposed rear single storey extension at approximately 6.1m projection would be acceptable. I find no reason to disagree with their findings.

7. Outriggers are visible to the rear elevations of other dwellings adjacent to the appeal site. These are similar house types to the appeal property. They are a characteristic of these dwellings although the property of 230 Golders Green Road is void of this element. In this respect, the properties are already imbalanced.
8. The outrigger of the appeal property, as demonstrated on the submitted plans is in scale and proportion to the host dwelling. The addition of an in-fill element together with the roof form as proposed would create an extension that would no longer resemble a traditional outrigger, or harmonise with the host dwelling.
9. Furthermore, there are no visible examples of this type of first floor extension that I could see along the back of the houses in close range of the appeal site. It would appear as an uncharacteristic form of development in this location that would be harmful to the appeal property, and as a consequence, the general area, despite the fact that it would not be clearly visible from the main road.
10. Although the internal space would be increased at first floor, and the extension would share a close relationship with the host dwelling, it would not appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling. This discordant appearance would be further emphasised given the combination of development as demonstrated on the proposed plans.
11. Furthermore, it would not comply with principles of good design within the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guidance 2016 (SPD) as it would not be appropriate design in this context. This is despite the fact that the SPD cannot cover every design, context or eventuality.
12. On this basis, it would not comply with the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 Policies CS1 and CS5 or the Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies, Development Plan Document 2012 Policies DM01 and DM02 in their collective aims to seek high standards of design and to protect local context and character. Furthermore, it would not comply with the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2016 or the Residential Design Guidance SPD 2016 in their design standards.

Other Matters

13. The appellant may exercise their prior approval rights at the site, although the proposal they have applied for is a combination of developments to which I have based my assessment on.
14. The Council have raised issues regarding unauthorised developments at the site. However, I have considered the proposal before me and this area is outside my scope to comment upon.
15. Objections received to the proposal are noted, although, as I am dismissing the appeal, there is no requirement to comment further.

Conclusion

16. Based on the information before me, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR