
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/21/3289752

2 Fairmead Crescent, Edgware, HA8 8YQ

- 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 Anna Korkosh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/4908/FUL, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as extensions to the front, side and rear of the property, alterations to the roof including the insertion of roof lights on the front, side and rear elevations, to facilitate a loft conversion. Internal reconfiguration to the existing bungalow to facilitate the provision of an additional dwelling. Provision of additional off-street parking space, refuse & recycling and cycle storage and external amenity area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original application and appeal were both submitted with 'c/o agent' as the applicant and appellant respectively. During the appeal process it has been confirmed by the agent that the appellant is Anna Korkosh. I have proceeded with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Fairmead Crescent is a quiet, suburban, residential street consisting mainly of modestly proportioned detached and semi-detached bungalows. Features such as curved front windows, hipped roofs and painted brick detailing provide visual interest within the street-scene. Tree lined verges provide separation between the highway and pedestrian footways, and along with the limited height and scale of buildings, provide a sense of openness.
5. The appeal site is located at the start of Fairmead Crescent adjacent to an area of amenity space, which includes a footway providing a direct pedestrian route to other residential streets and a local park. The footway is flanked by green space and mature trees. At the time of my site visit, the footway was in frequent use. A hedgerow separates the amenity space and appeal site.

6. The depth of the proposed rear extension does not exceed the guidelines for detached dwellings set out in the Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016). However, with the addition of the proposed crown roof and dormers to incorporate an additional storey of living accommodation, the height and depth of the rear extension would add considerable bulk and would appear very large relative to the existing building.
7. The proposed rear extension is narrower than the combined width of the existing building and side extension and the proposed crown roof is set down from the existing roof, thereby ensuring the proposed rear extension is obscured when viewed directly from the front. However, the side elevations of the proposed development would be visible along Fairmead Crescent and would be especially prominent when viewed from the adjacent amenity space and wide junction with Kenilworth Road. The low shrubs and well-spaced trees located on the adjacent amenity space would have a limited effect in screening the proposed development, which would be clearly visible above the height of the existing hedgerow. Therefore, when viewed from the side or rear, the rear extension would not appear subordinate to the original dwelling and, due to its large scale, would not be in-keeping with the character of the area.
8. The proposed rear extension including crown roof and dormers would, due to its scale and mass, form a dominant and inharmonious addition to the existing building. The proposal would not appear subordinate and would introduce a visually intrusive feature to the street scene. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. For these reasons, I find the proposal to be in conflict with Policy CS5 of Barnet's Core Strategy DPD (2012) and policy DM01 of Barnet's Development Management Policies Document DPD (2012) which generally seek to ensure development proposals respect local context and character. In addition, the proposal does not accord with the Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016) which requires new development to complement the character of the area, notably through respecting the scale and massing of the surrounding physical context.

Other Matters

9. I note that No 1 Fairmead Crescent, located opposite the appeal site, has been extended and subdivided to facilitate the formation of a new dwelling. Having observed No 1 during my site visit, I do not consider the schemes to be comparable. Notably, the works to No 1 do not appear insubordinate to the original dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having assessed the case against the development plan as a whole and having had regard to all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR