
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3260566

21 Snowdon Drive, Colindale, London, NW9 7RF.

- 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 Nicolae Voica against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/2568/RCU, dated 8 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2020
 - The development proposed is 1.42m high fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 21 Snowdon Drive, is a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling house. The general character of the surrounding development is one of dwellings with open frontages to the street.
4. The appellant proposes increasing the height of the original 1.0 metre high front and side brick boundary wall by about 1.4metres, installing an access gate and partly screening the front of the wall with a new hedge.
5. The overall height of the wall would be some 2.4 metres high. It would thereby obscure a significant part of the front elevation of the house from the street. In my judgement, the new wall and gate would, due to their height and form and, notwithstanding the proposed hedge, appear visually overbearing and incongruous in the context of the existing dwelling and the terrace of which it is part. Accordingly it would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host dwelling, the terrace and thereby the established character of the street scene.
6. I appreciate that the appellant is concerned about pedestrian safety given the prevailing levels and the height of the existing wall, the safety of his child playing in the amenity space in the front of the property and the potential of further burglary attempts. However, I consider that these issues could be

addressed by alternative means that would not cause the harm that I have identified.

7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would result in a prominent, incongruous and unsympathetic addition within the street scene, which would fail to respect the wider pattern of development, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. To allow it would be contrary to the objectives of Policy CS5 of the London Borough of Barnet's – Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (Adopted September 2012), Policy DM01 of the London Borough of Barnet's – Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (Adopted September 2012) and the London Borough of Barnet – Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Design Guidance* (Adopted October 2016) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the protection of the visual character of the borough.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR