



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021

by Stewart Glassar (Inspector)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3266971

64 Francklyn Gardens, Edgware, HA8 8RZ

- 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 and Mrs Grosskopf against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/4609/HSE, dated 29 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is part single/part two storey front, side and rear extensions. Loft conversion with two rear facing roof dormers to create two additional bedrooms.
-

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 appeal property and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. This part of Francklyn Gardens is generally characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. Although there are differing styles and some dwellings have had extensions and alterations, including the appeal property, the overriding appearance is one of modest buildings with hipped roofs. Together with their set back positions and front gardens there is a sense of homogeneity that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The appeal proposal would involve extensive remodelling of the host property. The remodelled building would include the use of a gabled form to the roof. There are other examples in the area of properties which have been extended and resulted in full height gables. However, in this case, the overall depth of the proposed works would not allow full height gables and would necessitate the use of a crown roof. The flat roof element of the main roof would clearly be visible from the street and would give the building an elongated appearance that would appear out of proportion to the scale of the existing dwelling and other buildings along the road.
5. As a result, the proposed works would create an incongruous looking dwelling which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider street scene. This harm would lead to conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy¹ and Policy DM01 of the Development

¹ Barnet's Local Plan: Core Strategy - Development Plan Document (2012)

Management Policies², which amongst other things seek to ensure development is of a scale that respects the local context and character. I have also had regard to the Council's Residential Design Guidance³, which for similar reasons would not support the appeal proposal.

Other Matters

6. I note that there are a number of other altered dwellings which are visible within the street scene, some of which have gabled roofs. As I have noted, they are generally full height and appear to assimilate acceptably in terms of their design and do not, based on what I have seen, harm the character and appearance of the street scene in the same way the appeal proposals would.
7. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would incorporate existing extensions into the redesign, to give the building a more uniform appearance. The works to the rear would not be widely visible and overall, much of the proposed work would be within the existing footprint of the building. However, these factors do not diminish the harm I have identified in relation to the over-extended appearance of the dwelling and so do not lead me to allowing the appeal.
8. Although the Council found that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours, this is a lack of harm and as such, it is a neutral consideration in any balance. Similarly, the support from neighbours does not mean that the scheme is acceptable and does not in any event absolve me from making an assessment as to its effects in regard to the main issue of the case.
9. I recognise the appellant's desire to increase the size of the dwelling and alter the building's internal arrangements and am mindful that the Framework⁴ supports the principle of adapting existing housing to meet future needs. However, the weight I could attach to these factors would not outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan that I have found and to which I ascribe substantial weight.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR

² Barnet's Local Plan: Development Management Policies - Development Plan Document (2012)

³ Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (2016)

⁴ National planning Policy Framework 2019