



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3253631

47 Oakdene Park, Finchley, London N3 1EU

- 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 Nicola Rose against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
- The application Ref 20/1185/HSE, dated 3 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2020.
- The proposed development is two storey rear extension.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the proposed development included within the application form contains superfluous information. As the description included within the decision notice is more concise, I have used this description in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Oakdene Park is a residential area that is almost entirely comprised of pairs of two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouses. Properties within the streetscene are primarily characterised by their projecting front gables, barge boards, hipped roof forms and prominent use of red brick. While some properties have been subject to extensions, Oakdene Park nevertheless has a visually uniform and homogeneous character and appearance. The appeal property forms part of one such semi-detached pair and is a typical example of a property within the street.
 6. The first-floor element of the proposal would introduce matt black painted timber cladding at a high level, which would be clearly visible within public views from the eastern side of Oakdene Park, as well as within private views from neighbouring properties. Due to its colour and materiality, as well as its
-

unusual curvilinear form, the proposed first-floor element would appear as an incongruous addition that would relate poorly to the proportions and traditional character of the appeal property. Furthermore, the single ply membrane proposed for the roof of the ground floor element would also contrast poorly with the original red brick of the appeal property and the red tiled roof of the adjoining property's ground-floor rear extension.

7. As these two elements of the proposal would appear especially prominent within public and private views, the proposal would undermine the established character and appearance of the area and so would therefore cause unacceptable harm in this regard. However, I do not consider that the use of clear finished timber cladding for the ground-floor element of the proposal would be unacceptable, as this element of the proposal would not be visually prominent within public or private views.
8. While I acknowledge that architecturally innovative proposals in a contemporary idiom should not be resisted in principle, proposals must also respond appropriately to the context of a site and its surrounding area in order to constitute good design. I have found that this would not be the case in this instance.
9. On this point, the appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal at 40 Loring Road and states that the comments of the Inspector in this case provide justification for the proposal's contemporary design. From the extract highlighted within the appellant's grounds of appeal, it is clear that the Inspector considered that the proposed development would have been mostly hidden from public views, whilst in this case I have found that the proposal before me would appear as a prominent and incongruous element within the streetscene. The case at 40 Loring Road is therefore not directly comparable to the proposal before me. In any case, each appeal must be considered on its own merits.
10. Although the appeal property is neither listed nor situated within a conservation area, this does not provide justification for the identified harm that would result from the proposal.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 and Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012 which, amongst other things, state that development should be of the highest quality design and should respect local context and character.
12. The proposal would also conflict with the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016, which states that contemporary design may be appropriate provided it has regard to local context.

Other Matters

13. While I note that the proposal would provide additional living space for the occupants of the appeal property, this would not outweigh the harm that would be caused as identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. 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