
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3286518

1 Braemar Gardens, London NW9 5LA

- 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 Sharma Ramtohul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/4535/HSE, dated 17 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was lodged in the name of Mr Sharma Ramtohul. The appeal was lodged in the name of Mr Ashley Ramtohul. It has been clarified that the name on the appeal form was given in error and I am satisfied that the applicant and the appellant are one and the same person.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 1 Braemar Gardens and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located within a wider residential area comprising broadly similar type properties. It occupies a corner site where Braemar Gardens joins Booth Road and as a consequence it is very prominent in the street scene with its front, side and rear elevations all exposed to view from the public domain. The property has previously been extended with a hip to gable alteration to its roof, including a large, box dormer to the rear elevation, a single-storey wrap around extension to the side and rear, and a first-floor side extension set in from the flank wall of the ground floor addition with a hipped roof. The proposal would alter the existing first floor addition by extending it sideways to be flush with the ground floor extension and rearwards, beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling by around

2.5m and wrapping partially around it. The roof would have a dummy pitch around its three sides with a flat crown.

5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): *Residential Design Guidance 2016*, seeks to ensure that extensions are normally subordinate to the original house, respect the original building and should not be overly dominant, being consistent in regard to the form, scale, and architectural style of the original building. Despite the large scale of the existing additions, the side extension appears appropriately proportioned in terms of its width and height relative to the original dwelling and with a roof form that shows some respect to the original form of this semi-detached pair. In contrast, due to the extended width of the first-floor element and altered roof form, I find that the proposed side extension would be out of proportion and harmony with the existing dwelling, appearing over-wide and squat. In addition, the wrap around form of the extension, with a large expanse of flat roof, would be at odds with the pitched roof form of the original building, and would join the dormer to the rear in an uncomfortable and poorly related manner. Overall, I find the scale and appearance of the proposed extension would be at significant odds with the existing building. The additions would be openly seen looking both east and west along Booth Road appearing incongruous and unsympathetic within the street scene.
6. The appellant has drawn my attention to two specific examples where corner properties within the borough have been extended to the side and rear. From the photographs supplied by the appellant it is clear that the cases at 47 The Greenway and 56 Angus Gardens bear no comparison with the appeal property. In both of those cases the side and rear extensions appear as well-proportioned and fully integrated additions that complement the architectural style of the original building.
7. For the reasons given, due to its size, position, and appearance, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of 1 Braemar Gardens and the wider street scene. As such it would conflict with the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) Policies CS1 and CS5, and the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (2012) Policy DM01. Together these policies require a high standard of design which respects the local context. By failing to respond positively to the site's context the proposal would also conflict with The London Plan 2021 Policy D3. For the same reasons there would be conflict with The National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places and as a consequence its presumption in favour of sustainable development is not triggered. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR