



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3281044

1 Lingholm Way, Barnet EN5 2SP

- 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 Ms Jenny Zourdani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/1792/HSE, dated 28 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as the “demolition of existing garage and store and construction of part single part double-storey side extension to a detached family house accommodating garage, habitable rooms and ancillary spaces”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house. To one side there is an attached garage which is set a significant distance behind the front building line. The property forms part of a group of houses that would have been to all intents and purposes identical when originally built. Some of them have been extended and altered, most notably 7 Lingholm Way which has a prominent side extension. This addition illustrates the level of harm to the otherwise relatively uniform appearance of the group that can result from development within the gaps between the houses.
4. The proposal would comprise the removal of the garage and the erection of a predominately 2-storey, pitched-roof, side extension with a gable to the rear. This would be larger than the side addition at No.7. Whilst the front elevation of the proposal would be set a small distance behind the adjacent part of the frontage of the house and the ridge would be slightly below that of the existing roof, the proposal would be a prominent element in the street scene. The infilling of the gap and the resulting terracing effect would significantly disrupt the spatial arrangement of the host property and the group of which it forms part.

5. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its size and siting, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. It is therefore contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) (2012), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) (2012), and guidance contained in the Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016). These policies and guidance seek to ensure that, amongst other matters, new development is well designed, respects the appearance, scale, and mass of surrounding buildings, and responds to the existing character of an area.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR