



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/21/3284600

Unit 1 and 1A, The Old Print Works, 25 Tapster Street, Barnet EN5 5TH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Mason, Tapster Street Properties, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/0754/OUT, dated 11 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing building and erection of part 3 and part 4 storey building comprising 7 flats with 2 parking spaces.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. This is an outline application with means of access, appearance, layout and scale to be considered. Landscaping is a reserved matter for future approval.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey building with a pitched roof. It is located to the north-western corner of the Old Print Works and adjacent to the rear of the buildings located along High Street. The building forms part of a linear run of primarily two-storey buildings with a newer three-storey building located at the opposite end of the run, adjacent to Tapster Street. These buildings have a broadly consistent ridge height with pitched roofs. There are examples of taller four-storey buildings within the surrounding area, for example Novia House and along High Street, but the appeal site has little visual connection with those buildings.
5. The scheme follows previous planning applications¹ and a dismissed appeal² at the site. The application proposes to demolish the existing building and construct a part-four, part-three storey building. The building would have a staggered roof height. The four-storey element would have a flat roof and the

¹ Including 20/0041/OUT, 19/3181/FUL and 18/6714/PNO

² APP/N5090/W/20/3251132

three-storey element would have a pitched roof which would step down towards unit 2.

6. I observed on my site visit that although the appeal site is within private grounds and is bound by built development and approved development, the appeal site is visible from surrounding roads. The main bulk of the new building would be four-storey in height with a flat roof which would be higher than the other buildings within the Old Print Works. The height and roof form of the four-storey element would fail to respect the neighbouring buildings, including within the Old Print Works. This would be evident from the surrounding area, including Tapster Street. Furthermore, the scheme would be more prominent and would visually read as a taller building than that approved at unit 4 due to the width of the proposed building and topography of the area.
7. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would appear as an incongruous addition to the Old Print Works and surrounding area. The scheme would fail to relate satisfactorily to the immediate context of the site and would harm the character and appearance of the streetscene and the locality in general. This is because of the scale, massing, height and roof form of the proposed four-storey element of the scheme.
8. Accordingly, the proposed development would conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM01 of the Barnet's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2012). These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure proposals preserve or enhance local character and respect the scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings and streets. It would also conflict with the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These promote good design and state that developments should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the other matters raised by the appellant. These include that the development is acceptable in other regards such as highways, future occupiers and existing occupiers as well as that it would contribute towards housing targets. Furthermore, the appellant has drawn my attention to permitted development rights relating to vertical extensions and London Plan (2021) policies. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR