



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2022

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/21/3289505

18A & 18B Plantagenet Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 5JG

- 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 KCH Contractors Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/5533/FUL, dated 8 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is Replacement of existing pitched roof with new mansard roof and first floor front extension to create a new one-bedroom flat at second floor level. Alterations to existing front elevation and vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey building with a pitched roof. It comprises of two residential flats. It is located in an area where there is a range of residential and commercial properties. The surrounding built environment is predominantly made up of 2 and 3 storey properties of various styles.
4. In its immediate context, the appeal property sits between Nos. 18 and 20A Plantagenet Road. No. 18 is a detached building that appears to be a modern development with accommodation over three storeys, with most of the third storey being within the large roof space of the property. This is the most dominant of the three buildings. No. 20A is a detached two storey building with part of the second floor extending beyond the eaves level. It is the least dominant of the three buildings.
5. The appeal property, in terms of its existing design, scale and mass, sits comfortably between these buildings, playing its part in a steady increase in height of the buildings in a southward direction following the slight rise in the road. Although it is of a different design, its roof reflects the simple and gradual incline of roof slopes that are applicable to the majority of properties in the surrounding area.

6. Notwithstanding the roof alteration, the proposed development would include alterations to the front elevation and the continuation of the existing front entrance porch to the second-floor level to provide access to the proposed new residential unit. Although the front extension would extend above the eaves level of the building, it would, due to its overall design and scale, not unreasonably dominate the host property or appear harmfully out of character in the context of the appeal property. The other alterations to the front elevation, including new cladding and fenestration would, for the same reasons, not cause harm.
7. In terms of the proposed roof alteration, this would be a steep sloping mansard style that does not appear prevalent in the immediate area. Its design would emphasise the bulk of the property with the resulting roof dominating the appearance of the property and appearing incongruous. Although its overall height would be less than no. 18, it would appear unapologetic and hard-edged in the context of the more gradually sloping roofs of the neighbouring buildings and those in the wider area generally.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development, due to its overall design, scale and massing, would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012) and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012). Collectively, these policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is of a high quality and standard of design and enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness with due regard to existing building types, forms and proportions.
9. The proposed development would also be contrary to guidance contained within the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) that outlines proposals for new residential development should respond to the distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context. It also outlines that new development should recognise the scale, massing and roof form of surrounding buildings and reflect these where they are a positive attribute of the area's character.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has outlined how the current scheme has sought to address previous reasons for refusal of planning permission, including matters raised at a previous appeal¹. I do not doubt the appellant's well intended course of action in this regard, however I have determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.
11. The appellant has referred to the fact that the appeal site is not within a conservation area. Be that as it may, the requirement for good design is applicable regardless. This is a neutral factor in the balance.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The Government's objective as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) is to support housing growth. The

¹ APP/N5090/W/19/3242569

proposed development would result in only a slight increase in the Council's overall housing number. Nevertheless, I give this matter moderate weight in favour of the proposed development.

13. However, the harm that I have identified that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area attracts significant weight that outweighs the benefits associated with the proposed development.
14. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no identified other considerations that outweigh this conflict.
15. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR