
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3287836

57 Greenfield Gardens, Cricklewood, London, NW2 1HU

- 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 Daniel Green against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/6264/HSE, dated 21 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'addition of new roof and single storey side extension'.
-

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 dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a chalet style detached dwelling that has been significantly altered and extended. It is located in part of the road that is largely characterised by detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings. Most of the dwellings along this part of Greenfield Gardens, including the appeal property, have a front hipped roof form. Some of the dwellings incorporate two storey front bays with a small gable above with the main hipped roof form beyond.
4. The appeal proposal is for a single storey ground floor extension together with a replacement roof which would enable additional floorspace at first floor level to be provided.
5. The Council has produced a *Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016)* (SPD) which provides detailed guidance in respect of, amongst other things, extensions to properties. The guidance includes that proposed extensions should be consistent with the form, scale, and architectural style of the original building. Extensions should normally be subordinate to the original house and the extension should respect the original building and should not be overly dominant.

6. The proposal would involve increasing the height of the dwelling. It would involve replacing the existing roof structure with a new roof over the extended first floor accommodation. The extension would have a large gable on both its front and rear elevation. The design of the proposal is such that other than for the ground floor, very little of the existing dwelling would be retained.
7. The appeal proposal would significantly change the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. To this extent, the extension would be overly dominant and would fail to be subordinate to the original house. It would have little regard to the form, scale and architectural style of the original building and would lack design detailing and articulation. In my view, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would conflict with the advice contained within the SPD.
8. Both the eaves and ridge height of the dwelling would be raised. Due to the sloping gradient along the road, the resultant eaves height would be higher than that of the adjacent dwelling, 55 Greenfield Gardens to the north, but would be lower than that of No 59 to the south. The ridge height would also sit in between that of the adjacent properties. Given the gradient of the road and the spacing between the dwellings concerned, the eaves and ridge height of the proposed new roof would generally be appropriate and consistent with that of the adjoining dwellings. I also note that planning permission, whilst unimplemented, was granted in 2009¹ for a two storey replacement dwelling with rooms in the roof space, albeit of a different design and appearance to the extended dwelling now proposed.
9. In my opinion, with regard to the current proposal, the proposed front and rear gables, due to their excessive width and overall expanse, would be incongruous and would appear dominant and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the adjacent dwellings which mostly have front hipped roofs. Large front gables are not a common feature of the street scene along Greenfield Gardens and the design and scale of the proposed gable would be at odds with the smaller size and scale of the gables that do exist above the two storey bays of some of the neighbouring dwellings.
10. Whilst the appellant highlights that the Council has granted planning permission for extensions to 52A Greenfield Gardens, I have not been provided with any further details of that consent. I also observed on my site visit that the existing dwelling at No 52A is of a different design to that of the appeal proposal and is not therefore of direct relevance to the consideration of the appeal.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document 2012, Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012 and the SPD. These policies and guidance seek to ensure that, amongst other matters, new development is of a high quality design that respects the appearance, scale, height and mass of surrounding buildings and respects local context and distinctive local character.

¹ LPA Ref. F/02039/09

Other Matters

12. I appreciate the challenges in designing an appropriate extension to the existing dwelling and the appellant's desire to provide additional family accommodation. I also acknowledge the ongoing discussions between the appellant and the Council and the willingness of the appellant to work towards an acceptable solution with the Council. I also note the length of time taken for the Council to formally determine the application. However, whilst the above matters are no doubt frustrating for the appellant, I am required to determine the appeal based on the individual merits of the case.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR