
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: 22 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3257609

13 Hadley Grove, Barnet EN5 4PH

- 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 Chris Dann against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/1582/HSE, dated 23 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a ground and first floor side extension and demolition of existing garage, associated external and internal works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor and first floor side extension and demolition of existing garage, associated external and internal works at 13 Hadley Grove, Barnet EN5 4PH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1582/HSE, dated 23 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: reference 0104_PLN_PRO-004 Rev 4 and 0104_PLN_PRO_005 Rev 4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Monken Hadley Conservation Area (MHCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal building is an attractive detached two storey dwelling, at the end of a street scene of similar semi detached examples. The front door is off set to the side of a two storey bay window, topped by an oversailing forward projecting gable feature. The roof is part hip and part gable. There is a two storey extension to one side which has an arch detailed parapet wall. The

materials, design, traditional detailing and proportioning of the dwelling, along with others in the street, make a positive contribution to the MHCA.

4. The proposed development, as well as removing a clearly more modern garage structure, would see a two storey extension to the side, replacing and spanning slightly further than the existing side extension. This would lead to the loss of an attractive and historic parapet wall feature. A shame though arguably this would be, I do not feel it would be detrimental to the design and detailing of the building as a whole and thus sufficient in and of itself to resist the proposed development.
5. The new extension would be subservient to the main body of the dwelling. It would have a crown roof, which are not uncommon features for the area. It would also span and thus subsume what is currently something of disjointed and tacked together number of separate extensions at ground and first floor. This would result in what would be, to my mind, a more holistic appearance to the building. The extension would also put to use a similar part brick and part render finish, ensuring an appropriate external appearance. Other changes such as the removal of the garage and addition of timber fretwork detailing to the front gable would be welcome improvements.
6. The proposed extension would not therefore be disproportionate and would respect the design of the building, without dominating the elevation it would be attached to or the building as a whole. It would incorporate an external finish, window and roof detail that is typical of both the host building and the wider area. There would therefore be no harm caused to the MHCA, the character and appearance of which would be preserved.

Other Matters

7. Whilst not including it as a reason for the refusal of planning permission, the Council have expressed substantive concerns over the impact of the removal of some green cover to the front and side boundaries. I note however that the submitted plans show the reinstatement of some hedging to these areas as well as the addition of a new brick wall which itself would be kept to a low level and thus be unobtrusive. I do not therefore object to this element of the proposed development.

Conditions

8. I have imposed conditions pertaining to the timescale for the commencement of works and the approved plans in the interests of clarity and enforceability respectively. I have also attached a condition, in the interests of a suitable external appearance to the proposed development, requiring external materials to match those of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons I have explained and subject to the conditions I have specified, the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR