



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3296769

18 Hadley Grove, Barnet EN5 4PH

- 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 Mrs Falco against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/5616/HSE, dated 21 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension, roof lights, a front porch and a garage conversion.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The host forms part of a short row of link-detached dwellings from Nos 18 to 28 (evens). With their alternate front gables, similar style and proportions, and their consistent facing materials, they form a very cohesive group in the streetscene.
4. Part 3 of the Design Guidance for Existing Residential Development in Barnet Supplementary Planning Document 2016 ('SPD') sets out, amongst other things, that extensions should normally appear subordinate to the original house, and consistent with it in regard to form, scale and style. It continues at paragraphs 14.15 and 14.16 that two storey side extensions should normally be less than half the width of the house, should be set down at least 0.5 metre from the ridge of the main roof, and that a set back of the front wall can help to reduce the visual impact on the streetscene.
5. Viewed from the front, the proposed extension would respect the general form of the host and the other properties in this row. It would also be faced with matching materials. However, its front elevation would be well over half the width of the host, and the resultant dwelling's elongated proportions would thereby disrupt the harmonious rhythm of this group of houses. Given its bulk, its limited set down at ridge level and the lack of a set back at ground floor, it would not appear fully subordinate to the host property. It would thus have a domineering and disruptive impact on the host and the streetscene.

6. Given that the site is on a corner plot, and that part of the proposed two storey side extension would project very close to the boundary with Christ Church Lane, the proposal would also have a very domineering impact viewed from there. To the rear, the proposed projecting two storey gable would add to the resultant dwelling's bulk and complexity, and it would be at odds with the far simpler form of the other dwellings in this group.
7. For these reasons, the scheme would conflict with those parts of Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy 2012, and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012, which seek the highest standards of urban design and respect for local context and character. It would also conflict with the guidance in the SPD.
8. I have very few details of the allegedly similar planning applications referred to at paragraph 1.10 of the appellant's statement, but none are located in Hadley Grove or Christ Church Lane, and they do not therefore impact those streetscenes.
9. In its favour, the scheme would include a separate area for independent living with disability access, and would thus provide affordable and sustainable accommodation for family members, and would more generally help to address the increasing need for such forms of living space. However, having considered the scheme on its planning merits, those benefits do not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
10. The scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and, having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR