



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3256895

11 Hodford Road, Golders Green, London NW11 8NL

- 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 Adam Erusalimsky against the decision the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/1844/HSE, dated 18 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a part single, part double rear extension, replacement of the existing front porch, addition of 1 No. roof-light on the front elevation and associated landscaping and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary matters

3. The appeal development consists of various elements, as described above. The Council has found them acceptable, except for the rear extension. I have considered the appeal proposal on the basis of the reason for refusal.
4. The Council has granted permission for 2 schemes¹ at the appeal property, which have some similarities with the appeal proposal. I have had regard to them in so far as they relate to the appeal development. The scheme² that has been dismissed at appeal is considerably different from the appeal proposal, therefore it has not been determinative in my consideration of this appeal development.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, located within a residential area. Neighbouring properties visible from the rear garden of the appeal site have rear extensions with a variety of different scales and designs.

¹ Applications ref: 19/6817/HSE & 20/2918/HSE

² Appeal ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3237940

7. The rear extensions previously approved for the appeal property are similar to the proposal before me, particularly with regard to the scale and design of the single storey part, and the depth and roof style of the first-floor rear extension. Therefore, I consider that the main issue relates to the width and position of the first-floor element, which differs in all 3 schemes, including the proposal before me.
8. Due to the extensive width coupled with the proposed arrangement at the first-floor level, the appeal scheme would lack consistency in terms of windows proportions and alignment in relation to each other. Therefore, the proposed rear extension would fail to appear as a cohesive and well-proportioned addition. Accordingly, when seen as a whole, the rear extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. The rear extension would not appear out of context when viewed in relation to the rear extensions of the neighbouring properties, and given its position to the rear, the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area would be limited. Nevertheless, this does not negate the harmful impact that the extension would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a scheme³ for which the Council has granted planning permission at No 7 Hodford Road. Notwithstanding the similarities in terms of the width of the first-floor rear extensions, this scheme is not directly comparable with the appeal proposal as in that case there was consistency in terms of proportions and position of the first-floor rear windows. Thus, I attach limited weight to it and have determined the proposal in light of the specific details of this case.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies), and Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy), which collectively require, amongst other things, that new developments preserve or enhance the appearance of surrounding buildings.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR

³ Application ref: 15/07672/HSE