

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3326817

97 Harrowes Meade, Edgware, Barnet HA8 8RS

- 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 Y Benouaich against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1133/HSE, dated 10 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side and rear extension following demolition of the existing garage; and new front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The principle of extending this dwelling, as generally proposed, has already been accepted by the council's decision to allow application 22/5462/HSE. The two proposals differ in that the approved plans include a set back of the side extension from the side boundary with matching overhanging eaves whilst this proposal would extend to the boundary with a roof form with no eaves overhang or rainwater goods to the flank elevation.
 4. The main concern is that the proposal would result in the closing of the gap between these two properties. Whilst this would occur to an extent with the approved plans, the set back approved would at least retain the individual design characteristics of the two dwellings and provide some, albeit limited, separation. This dwelling, in common with most others in this road, has large overhanging eaves which are a distinctive feature of their design. The proposal would detract from this design characteristic. The council are also concerned about the disposal of rainwater, the management of which is unclear.
 5. Building hard to the boundary as proposed, would detract from the design of this dwelling and would further erode the spatial characteristics of this street. The revised proposal represents poor design in this context. It would be contrary to the design aspirations of policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); and policy DM01 (a & b) of the Local Plan document,
-

Development Management Policies (2012). As these policies generally accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them full weight.

6. The proposal also conflicts with the specific advice within the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 as this seeks a set in from the boundary; and appropriate roof forms with matching materials and details.
7. The proposal would result in the two bedrooms within the new addition to be larger. It is clear that the appellant considers the greater size of the two rooms to be necessary given their particular family circumstances. I afford weight to this. The previously approved room sizes would however offer reasonable space standards and in these circumstances, the weight I afford to the benefits of the current proposal are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns with regard to the design and appearance shortcomings.
8. It is evident that there are a number of additions to houses in the area that do not satisfy the current policy requirements of the development plan. It is unclear when these were approved and as such, I cannot assume that the council has been inconsistent in the application of its current policies. The two cases specifically referred to, at numbers 76 and 105, predate the current development plan and national design expectations set out in the *Framework*. Those extensions are also not entirely comparable but in any event, I must consider this proposal on its own merits and in the light of current policies.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would represent poor design and this would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR