
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3328286
4 Meadow Drive, Hendon, London NW4 1SA

- 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 Jonathan Nesbitt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 23/1750/HSE, dated 21 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is to erect 2-storey side and rear extensions and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The proposal is to enlarge and externally alter the appeal property, which is a mainly 2-storey semi-detached dwelling within a predominantly residential area. Along Meadow Drive, I saw that dwellings were generally 2-storey with several properties that included sizeable side and rear extensions including the attached counterpart, which is 2 Meadow Drive. As a result, Nos 2 and 4 are not a matching pair when seen from the rear and there is some variety to the appearance of the existing built form in the local area to which the site belongs.
5. The new ground floor rear extension would extend across almost the full width of the plot and therefore exceed the width of the main 2-storey house. It would also project outwards from the main rear wall albeit no deeper into the back garden than the single storey rear addition to No 2. The new 2-storey element would also be a notable addition with a gable facing towards the garden and the first floor wrapping around a rear corner of the completed house. Together, these extensions would elongate the built form of No 4, significantly enlarge its footprint and noticeably add to its scale and mass.

6. Given their considerable scale, the proposed extensions would be disproportionate additions to the host building even taking into account the existing built form and site coverage of No 2. The main outcome would be that the side and rear façades of the main dwelling would be overwhelmed. The proposed first floor wrap around feature at the side and rear of the finished dwelling would also set it clearly apart from other buildings in the local area that do not appear to have been extended in this way.
7. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the proposed use of materials to match the existing building. I also acknowledge that the full extent of the proposal would not be readily evident from public vantage points given the position of the new extensions at the side and back of the main house. While only partly visible in the local street scene, these extensions would nonetheless form part of the characteristics of the area as experienced and appreciated from nearby houses and gardens. When viewed from the adjacent properties, the proposed extensions would draw the eye as overly large additions with a discordant and uncharacteristic first floor wrap around element.
8. I appreciate that the Council has only referred to the first-floor rear extension in the reason for refusal. However, the 2-storey and single storey extensions are inextricably linked, and planning permission is sought for the development as a whole. I have assessed the proposal afresh on that basis and on its own individual merits.
9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it is contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies). These policies aim to ensure that new development represents high quality design, preserves or enhances local character and respects local context. These principles underpin the advice within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Design Guidance*, with which the proposal would also conflict.
10. I note that the Council provided pre-application advice with regard to extending the appeal dwelling and that the proposal was amended after the application submission. The appellant has therefore gone to some lengths to identify the Council's views and to address its concerns. I also note that others raise no objection including the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
11. Nevertheless, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR