



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 October 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3254395

3 Rockways, Barnet EN5 3JJ

- 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 & Mrs R & L Gold against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/1546/HSE, dated 23 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey front/side extensions and single storey rear extension 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a residential area. The dwelling currently has a single storey attached garage to the side and a conservatory to the rear. The proposal would replace the conservatory with a single storey rear extension and also includes part single storey, part two-storey front and side extensions to increase the internal living accommodation. The Council have not raised any concerns with the single storey elements of the proposed development and therefore this appeal focusses on the two-storey elements.
5. The Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016) states that large, front extensions will not normally be permitted because of their effect on the street scene and character of the area in general. Although there is variety in the detailed design of properties within Rockways, there are no other gable projections apparent in the surrounding area comparable to the two-storey front extension proposed. Furthermore, this extension would be a significant addition to the host dwelling despite its ridge height being lower than the main dwelling. Overall, due to its scale and its forward projection of the current building line, the front extension would appear as in an incongruous feature within the streetscene.

6. It is noted that the SPD also states that a building may be reasonably extended forwards where it involves a detached house in a low density area, which the appellant considers to be the case for this proposal. Although the appeal property is a detached house, it is located within a suburban area with the dwellings positioned relatively close together and is not considered to be low density. Therefore, the front extension would not be in accordance with the SPD.
7. Although the side extension would be set back from the new front elevation of the dwelling, the cumulative impact of the proposed two-storey front extension and the two-storey side extension would create an extended dwelling which would have a piecemeal appearance due to their varying heights and roof forms. Furthermore, the resultant size of the property would be substantially larger than the two adjacent dwellings and others within the streetscene and would appear overly large and dominant in comparison.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would therefore be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) or Policy DM01 of the Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012). These policies collectively seek to ensure the highest standards of urban design with development that respects local context and distinctive local character including the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings. It would also not be in accordance with the Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016) as detailed previously.

Other Matters

9. A front extension at 14 Rockways was highlighted by the appellant. However, from the details provided, that extension is more cohesive than the proposal before me, respecting the form of the host dwelling and the character of the street scene. It is therefore not comparable.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR