
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2021

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3271169

25 Alba Gardens, Golders Green, London NW11 9NS

- 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 M Heller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/5558/HSE, dated 27 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and alterations to porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The proposed development includes the erection of a 2-storey side extension to an existing semi-detached dwelling located at the junction of Alba Gardens and Brookside Road. By reason of siting, the property is a prominent building within the streetscene along Brookside Road.
4. When viewed from Alba Gardens, the proposed side extension's roof would be set down below the existing ridge, the extension's front elevation would be set back at first floor level from the property's front elevation and it would be less than half the width of the property. On this basis the proposed development would accord with the guidance contained in *Barnet's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (RDG). However, the RDG also includes general design guidance whereby account should be taken of the angle and position of a house and whether this may increase the visual effect of an extension in the streetscene. Further, alterations should complement the roof form of the original house and the surrounding area.
5. The design, width and roof form of the proposed porch would unbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings, especially where the existing porch is a distinctive design for this pair of dwellings.

6. The proposed side extension would be a contrived design with an angled flank wall sited adjacent to the footway along Brookside Road. The width at the front elevation of the proposed extension would be greater than at the rear. The proposed development would also have a crown roof which is not a common roof form within the surrounding area. As such, the appeal scheme would not represent a high quality of design which would be well related to the form of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
7. The side elevation of the property is already sited closer to the footway than the front elevations of a garage building and 7 Brookside Road. These buildings do not create a prominent building line along this part of the streetscene. However, the siting of the proposed 2-storey flank wall adjacent to the footway and the enlargement to the current dwelling would together significantly increase the visual and physical prominence of the resulting property both at this junction and in the streetscene along Brookside Road.
8. Reference has been made by the appellant to other dwellings at road junctions within the surrounding area where elevations are sited close to footways. These other examples were observed during the site visit but appeared to be either originally designed to front the footways or subsequent alterations involving mainly the erection of single, rather than 2-storey, extensions. Accordingly, and in the absence of their detailed planning circumstances, these other schemes have been given limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policy CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy), Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document and the RDG. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to all developments representing high quality design. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR