
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3260715
45 Springwood Crescent, Edgware HA8 8SE

- 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 D Jackson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/1737/HSE, dated 7 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear and two storey side extension at 45 Springwood Crescent, Edgware HA8 8SE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1737/HSE, dated 7 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: No. 220058/01 and No. 220058/02 Rev A.
 - 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.
 - 4) The roof of the extension hereby permitted shall only be used in connection with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area.
 - 5) No site works (including any temporary enabling works, site clearance and demolition) or development shall take place until details showing the location of trees and their root protection area accurately plotted in relation to the proposed development are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Tree protection measures must be outlined to clearly demonstrate that the work will proceed without significant harm to tree roots.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property at No. 45 Springwood Crescent is a two storey end terrace dwelling situated on a corner plot set back from the road running alongside the site. It is located within a mature well-established residential area with a mixture of two, three and four storey properties of varied character. Nos. 45 and 46 Springwood Crescent form a pair of two storey properties, of similar proportions, that are smaller in scale and staggered further back than the adjoining three storey terraced properties to the west of the site.
4. The proposal would entail the construction of a two storey side extension that would project out by about 3.5m from the side elevation of the property. It would be set back about 1m from the front elevation of the property and would be constructed with a half hipped pitched roof that would be stepped down below the ridge line of the host property. The proposal would also involve the construction of a single storey rear extension with a flat roof that would extend across the full width of the extended house and project out by about 2.75m from the rear elevation of the property.
5. The Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD) states that side extensions should be subordinate to the main dwelling and should generally not be more than half of the width of the original house. In this case, the proposed side extension would be just over half the width of the host property. It would set back from the side boundary and would be separated from the road by a grass verge with a semi-mature tree together with a high boundary fence and pedestrian footpath running alongside the property.
6. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extensions would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Whilst the proposed side extension would be located in a prominent position, it would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles around the host property and in the surrounding area.
7. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed side extension, set back and stepped down within a staggered frontage, would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The modest overall scale and proportions of the side extension, together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property and would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with Policy CS5 of the Barnet's Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM01 of the Barnet's Development Management Policies Document 2012, Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and the SPD. These

policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design that respects the local context in terms of appearance, scale and design of the development and responds to the overall character of the area.

Conditions

9. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area and safeguard the amenities of the nearby residents, I have imposed a condition requiring matching external materials. In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties, I have also imposed a condition restricting the use of the flat roof over the extension.
10. In addition, a condition relating to the protection of the existing trees is necessary in order to ensure their survival and to protect the visual amenity of the trees.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR