



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2023

by C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3319111

2 Boltmore Close, London, NW4 1EX

- 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 Raphael Weisz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/4727/HSE, dated 21 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of 2 Boltmore Close and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The application site is accessed via a private lane off Great North Way. The lane serves two dwellings, the appeal property and neighbouring dwelling 1 Boltmore Close. The dwellings are detached, and single storey and it appears that they would have originally been constructed to mirror each other in terms of design. Neighbouring property 1 Boltmore Close has a pitched roof extension on the front elevation, which connects to a flat roofed garage. There are no extensions on the front elevation of the appeal property. To the south of the front elevation of 2 Boltmore Close is a detached double garage, based on the submitted information, this garage is shared by both 1 and 2 Boltmore Close.
4. The proposed extension would provide living accommodation and would mimic the design and footprint of the extension and garage on the front elevation of the neighbouring property. It is acknowledged that this approach would result in the dwellings appearing symmetrical. However, the scale of the proposal is such that the extension would project several metres over a large proportion of the front elevation. As such it is considered that the proposal would dominate the principal elevation of the dwelling.
5. The proposed extension and existing double garage would result in the development of the majority of the western boundary of the plot, and the end of the narrow lane, making it feel cramped. As such it is considered that the proposal would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area.

6. As detailed above, the proposal reflects the extension and garage on the front elevation of 1 Boltmore Close. However, I do not have details of the circumstances that led to these extensions being accepted. I noted the position of the existing shared double garage to the front of the appeal property, there is no similar development to the front of 1 Boltmore Close. The proposed extension would provide habitable rooms, whereas the garage makes up large proportion of the extended area on the front of the neighbouring property. As such, I do not consider them to be a direct parallel.
7. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of 2 Boltmore Close and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the LB Barnet: Local Plan (Core Strategy) DPD (2012), Policy DM01 of the LB Barnet: Local Plan (Development Management Policies) DPD (2012), these policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in requiring the new development respects local distinctiveness. The proposal is also contrary to LB Barnet: Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016), which specifies that extensions should be subordinate to the original house and should not be overly dominant.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR