
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3258663

30 Fitzjohn Avenue, Barnet EN5 2HW

- 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 Mrs Lorraine Evans against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/2703/HSE dated 15 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension involving hip to gable end to existing dwelling. Part single, part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension, including 2no. skylights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal building is one of a pair of semi detached two storey dwellings set back from and facing the road. Save for the conversion of the hipped roof at the side to a gable, the dwelling presents to the street scene as a largely unaltered mirror image of the one to which it is attached. The gable aside, the buildings have a strong symmetry to their detail, design and scale with a shallow pitched roof, forward projecting asymmetrical gables and a front door off set from a curved ground floor bay window.
4. The proposed development would make a number of alterations to the dwelling. A hip to gable conversion and a dormer window extension have already been added following the issuing of a certificate of lawful development¹. In addition, I share the Council's view that the single storey element proposed would be acceptable. It would be subservient, low rise and largely unobtrusive due to its siting on the rear elevation.
5. The width of the two storey side extension would be over half that of the main body of the original house. This, coupled with its overall land take, two storey height and use of a gable roof would add considerable bulk and mass to the

¹ Council reference 19/4189/192

building, dominating it and erasing the symmetry of the semis, making them present as somewhat lopsided to the street scene. Furthermore, the use of a forward projecting lean to roof at ground floor level would appear awkward against the existing ground floor bay and the lowest point of the asymmetric gable feature from which it would detract.

6. Whilst most of the pairs of semi detached dwellings in the immediate area are tightly spaced, there is a defined open area of land between the appeal building and No 26 which makes the elevation proposed for extension that more visible and thus exacerbating the effects I have mentioned.
7. The appeal scheme would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would render it in conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy² and Policy DM01 of the Local Plan³, as well as the Council's Residential Design Guidance⁴. Amongst other things and in regard to changes to dwellings specifically, these policies and guidance seek to ensure the highest standards and quality of design in architecture which respects local context and character.

Other Matters

8. I appreciate that the design of the side extension has sought to appear subservient through stepping the ridge height down and part of the front elevation back. This would go some way to reducing the impact of the side extension but not so that it would make it acceptable.
9. Planning permission was granted on appeal for the erection of a part single and part two storey side extension⁵. It is extant at the time of writing. The plans to which this relates have been provided in the appellant's evidence. It appears the width of the side extensions would be the same albeit the extant scheme would have a hipped roof which is arguably more suited to the pair of buildings than a gable, which in itself would also add bulk and mass to the extension beyond that which was approved. I agree that a gable to the extension proposed in the appeal scheme before me would relate better to the now altered roof of the appeal building. That said, this in itself has had an unbalancing effect on the pair of semis and through the design and substance of the proposed additions before me, this situation would be exacerbated. With this in mind, I am not persuaded to allow the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons I have set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

² Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document 2012

³ Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012

⁴ Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016

⁵ Planning Inspectorate reference APP/N5090/D/19/3239253