



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3291986

24 Holders Hill Gardens, Hendon, London NW4 1NP

- 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 Schechter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/4711/HSE, dated 25 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage to habitable room, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of garage to habitable room, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 24 Holders Hill Gardens, Hendon, London NW4 1NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/4711/HSE, dated 25 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 210617/01; 210617/02; 210617/03; 210617/04; 210617/05; 210617/06; 210617/07; 210617/08; 210617/09; 210617/10; 210617/11; 210617/12; 210617/13.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of a semi-detached dwelling on the western side of Holders Hill Gardens. It is adjacent to a pedestrian alleyway that connects to Holders Hill Drive, and Holders Hill Crescent beyond.
4. The development would introduce a 2 storey side extension to the southern flank of the property. This would be set in from the boundary at first floor level

on the Holders Hill Gardens frontage, but would abut the alleyway at its southwestern corner. This arrangement would have the effect of partially enclosing the alleyway along one side and it would reduce the sense of openness at this point. However, views of the rear 2 storey projection would only be available from along a relatively short section of the alleyway, and an even shorter section of Holders Hill Gardens. Moreover, it would be set down from the main ridge height of the property, on lower ground than the alleyway leading to it from the rear, and would be partially screened by vegetation. These factors would limit its visual impact, and I do not consider that the extension would appear unduly dominant or bulky from either the road or the alleyway.

5. During my site visit, I observed that properties are built up to the alleyway where it meets both Holders Hill Drive and Holders Hill Crescent. Moreover, there is a significant degree of variation along the street, and several nearby houses have been significantly extended. In this context, I do not consider that the appeal proposal would appear out of place.
6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of either the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policy D3 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, amongst other things, that new development is well designed, respects the appearance, scale, and mass of surrounding buildings, and responds to the existing character of an area.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary in the interest of certainty. A further condition relating to the external facing materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR