



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3323137

7 Millson Close, Whetstone, Barnet London N20 0LQ

- 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 Ms Fabiola Murta against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/0728/HSE, dated 16 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey extension. Insertion of window to side elevation. Insertion of bi-folding doors to rear elevation at ground level. Alteration/enlargement of 2 first floor rear windows including the addition of railings to create Juliette balconies.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development varies between documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the one from the Council's decision notice, as this is a full and most accurate description of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house of a late 20th Century contemporary design. It is located on a close in a densely developed area made up of similar terraces, which appear to have undergone very little extension or alteration. This lends a strong sense of uniformity and cohesion to the character and appearance of the local streetscape.
5. The proposed front 2 storey extension would provide a revised front entrance location and utility room at ground level, with a study at first floor level. The proposed extension would stretch across approximately 2 thirds of the front elevation, aligning with the flank wall of the appeal dwelling and would be directly adjacent to the boundary of the appeal property and the footway.

6. In design, scale and form it would closely replicate the design of the front outriggers to other houses in the close and local area, which form a distinctly local feature and characteristic of the streetscape. This architectural feature is, however also defined by symmetrical spacing between the outriggers, often with a small, fenced garden space between.
7. The design of the proposed front extension would result in it being more than half the width of the existing house, not set down from the main roof within 1 metre of the boundary. As such, the proposal would not accord with the guidance set out in paragraphs 14.15 to 14.17 Barnet Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016).
8. Whilst replicating the scale and architectural form of the existing outriggers to other houses in the terrace and close, the positioning of the proposed front extension would result in it sitting close to an existing outrigger in the terrace. The space between the two would be approximately half of the distance between existing outriggers to houses in terrace and close. This would result in a visually cramped physical relationship, which would fail to reflect the spatial arrangement and characteristic of the area identified above.
9. Due to the scale and positioning of the proposed front extension in close proximity to the neighbouring front outrigger, it would appear to dominate the appearance of the appeal dwelling and would form an incongruous feature to the terrace of which it forms part. As such, the proposal would contrast with the existing pattern of development and spatial characteristics of the local area and would appear as a discordant element within the existing harmonious and cohesive streetscape.
10. Due to the end of terrace positioning of the appeal dwelling, which sits adjacent to an open parking area, the visual effect of the proposal on the terrace and local area detailed above would be very apparent in local and wider street views of the appeal dwelling, from where it would appear as bulky, cramped, incongruous and unduly prominent. As such it would represent a discordant intervention that would fail to reflect the existing character and appearance of the local area.
11. It is noted that the Council find that the other alterations and additions that form part of the proposal, reflect the character and appearance of the local area. I see no reason to demur from this conclusion, and I find that these would, in themselves, not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part or that of the local area. Lack of harm in this instance is, however, a neutral factor in my considerations.
12. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed development would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area. As such it would fail to accord with policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2012), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). These collectively seek development that is of a high standard of design, including

urban design, and respects local context and preserves or enhances local character.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR