
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3262496
2 Talgarth Walk Colindale London NW9 7HW

- 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 Bolanie Ogunleye against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/2639/HSE, dated 10 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front infill extension, incorporating a glazed roof, following the existing roof line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the submission of the appeal the London Plan 2021 has been published. The Council's reason for refusal includes policies within the London Plan 2016. The London Plan 2021 does not diverge significantly from the previous plan in terms of seeking to create a strong sense of place and achieve high quality design appropriate to the local context. Given the circumstances of the appeal before me, it does not raise fresh considerations necessitating further comment by the parties in this case.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 2 Talgarth Walk, (No 2) is one of four relatively modern back to back dwellings situate at the far end of a terraced block of dwellings. The area as a whole is characterised by similar blocks of residential dwellings and larger three storey buildings linked by walkways. No 2 shares the same cat-slide design over its entrance porch as No 1, and the same side elevation as No 3 facing a grassed open area. There is consequently a symmetry and regular pattern of development in this location. No 2, and in particular its side elevation, is highly visible in views from the car parking area and the walkway leading from this area.
5. No 2 is a modest property and the proposed extension would be a sizeable addition. It would appear unduly prominent within the context of the side

elevation and highly visible in public views. Whilst the design of the proposed extension would replicate the existing roof slope and align with part of the front and part flank elevations, it would also remove the catslide design and lower the eaves. This would disrupt the symmetry within the terrace of dwellings and would result in an unbalanced and discordant appearance. I appreciate that No 2 is not a listed building, nor within a Conservation Area. Nonetheless, the scale and design of the proposed extension is such that it would give rise to development at odds with the current appearance of No 2 and the adjacent properties at Nos 1 and 3, to the detriment of visual harm in this location.

6. The appellant's agent has referred to the area as being characterised by properties dominated by extensions and my attention has specifically been drawn to four other front/side extensions to properties within the locality approved by the Council. However I did not observe on my site visit any developments which relate to this type of design in similar circumstances to that found at the appeal property. Likewise none of the approvals for the front/side extensions reflect the type of design proposed in this case. I have limited information about the history of these developments but in any event their contexts differ to that of the proposal before me. As such they merit only limited weight and do not lead me to a different view in this case.
7. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposal would be a visually obtrusive form of development to the host property and would harm the character and appearance of the streetscene and wider area. As such it would conflict with the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) Policies CS1 and CS5, and the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policy DM01, which together require a high standard of design which respects the local context. In addition, it would conflict with the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, which in general restricts front extensions. It would also conflict with policies within the London Plan, 2021 which promote good design.

Other Matters

8. In reaching my decision I have had regard to references in the National Planning Policy Framework which support the proposal including the effective use of land, optimising the potential of a site, the sustainable location of the property close to facilities and the provisions of good design. I acknowledge that the proposal would be of benefit to the appellant and family in providing enhanced living accommodation. I note too that the development is acceptable in relation to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, these matters do not outweigh the findings I have made in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of No 2 and the area. The appellant highlights the proposal would be constructed in matching materials, however aspects of good design are fundamental in all development and would not represent a notable benefit.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR