



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3296546

1 Uplands Road, Barnet, EN4 8NY

- 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 Ladi Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/4292/HSE, dated 1 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension following demolition of existing conservatory on ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies CSNPPF, CS1 and CS5 in Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012) and policy DM01 in the Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012) which together, require that new development is of the highest quality design. The National Planning Policy Framework has a similar objective. Of particular relevance to this case, policy CS1 seeks to protect and enhance Barnet's high quality suburbs and policy DM01 requires that proposals respect the scale and massing of the surrounding area.
3. The appeal site occupies a corner plot within a suburban area and comprises the end dwelling in a short terrace of three built in the inter-war years in a style typical of that period with a hipped roof and a gable projection with bay windows facing Uplands Road. It has a long side boundary with Woodfield Drive in which dwellings of a similar style are set back from the road but in close proximity to one another, creating a long terracing effect. The side and rear garden of the appeal site and the openness at first floor level makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area by providing some openness at the top of Woodfield Drive in contrast to the more built up character elsewhere in the road.
4. The dwelling has been extended in the past with a single storey, flat roofed extension to the side and rear and a rear conservatory. The proposal includes a wrap around extension to the side and rear at first floor level and a single storey rear extension. The Council has not objected to the single storey part of

the proposal which would replace the conservatory on the rear elevation and from what I have seen this would be acceptable.

5. With regard to the first floor extension, the Council's Residential Design Guidance requires that on corner sites, such extensions do not project beyond the building line on the adjoining road. Whilst the existing dwelling is already set forward of those dwellings, the proposal would increase the mass of building along the boundary at first floor level and is clearly contrary to that guidance. It would extend some 9.9m along and in close proximity to the side boundary with Woodfield Drive and would be very clearly seen in the street scene above the boundary fence. It would have a hipped roof to match the main roof, would be set down from the main ridge and back from the main front wall and would be no more than half of the width of the dwelling at first floor level with matching materials. However, by reason of its considerable length, its scale and mass would not be subservient to that of the existing dwelling when seen from Woodfield Drive. Given its siting on slightly higher ground than the dwellings on Woodfield Drive, its impact would be greater.
6. The loss of openness along the side boundary and the overly dominant mass of building would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal does not amount to the high quality design sought by the local and national policies referred to earlier.
7. Although the single storey rear part of the proposal would be acceptable, it is not clearly severable from the first floor element and I am therefore unable to issue a split decision.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector