



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3336602 19 Parsons Crescent, Edgware, Barnet, HA8 8QG

- 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 Ben Sandground against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 23/1962/HSE, dated 4 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and first floor side / rear wrap around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and first floor side / rear wrap around extension at 19 Parsons Crescent, Edgware, Barnet, HA8 8QG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/1962/HSE, dated 4 May 2023 and in accordance with the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing/Proposed Floor Plans 3001 Rev P01; and Existing/Proposed Elevations 3601 Rev P01; and Proposed Site Location Plan 0001 Rev P01.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal property benefits from a recent lawful development certificate¹ for a roof extension involving hip to gable, rear dormer and 3no. front facing rooflights following removal of existing hip-to-side addition.
3. The Council states that the proposed development would not harm the amenity of neighbours to either side of the appeal property and it does not raise any

¹ Reference: 23/2534/192.

other concerns in respect of residential amenity. Consequently, the main issue in this case is that set out below.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling.
6. It is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind short front gardens and/or parking areas and with longer gardens to the rear. The use of brick and tile building materials and design features including hipped roofs and bays comprise features common to the area.
7. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings have been altered and/or extended. Whilst such changes tend to appear in keeping with host dwellings and the surrounding area, they have resulted in considerable differences in the appearance of individual dwellings.
8. Further, alterations and extensions to dwellings already close to one another has resulted in a relatively dense, built-up character. However, the effect of this is softened by the presence of gardens, the setting-back of dwellings from the street and the presence of grass verges, hedgerows and street trees.
9. The proposed development would include a porch that would project forward of the appeal dwelling's bay frontage. In so doing, I find that the proposed porch would result in a more satisfactory alignment of the appeal property and its neighbour, Number 21 Parsons Crescent, the porch of which projects well forward of No 19 adjacent to the shared front boundary of the two dwellings.
10. Further to the above, I observed during my site visit that a very wide range of altered and extended front porches is characteristic of Parsons Crescent. The proposed porch would add a variance in keeping with this characteristic, whilst the porch itself would be of reasonably modest proportions and would appear subordinate to and in harmony with, the host dwelling.
11. I also noted during my site visit that many dwellings along Parsons Crescent have first floor extensions to the side, all of which extend either close to, or immediately adjacent to, shared boundaries. I also observed that some of these extensions do not step back from the front elevation.
12. The proposed first floor extension appears to have been carefully designed to step back from the front elevation and to wrap around the side and rear of the dwelling in a way that maintains a notable gap to the shared boundary with No 21. In this way, I find that the proposal would successfully extend the host dwelling in a manner that would fully utilise its existing built footprint whilst minimising the loss of garden space.
13. The set back and stepped character of the proposed first floor extension would I find, result in it appearing as a light and modest addition relative to "blockier" more bulky examples of two storey extensions elsewhere along Parsons

Crescent. It would step down considerably from the height of the host dwelling and would not appear especially wide. Consequently, I find that the proposal would appear in proportion with and subordinate to, the host dwelling.

14. Further to the above, the proposed materials and design of the proposal, including its hipped roof, would match its surroundings, ensuring that it would appear in keeping with the character of the area.
15. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; to Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); to Policy DM01 of Barnet's Adopted Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012); and to the Barnet Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 56 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
17. A condition controlling external surfaces is necessary in the interests of local character.

Other Matters

18. In support of his case, the appellant states that no objections have been raised. However, the absence of an objection could be for any number of reasons that it does not, in itself, amount to support for a proposal.
19. Notwithstanding the above, whilst the Council does not raise any concerns in respect of the effect of the proposal on residential amenity, I note that representations have been received from neighbours in respect of the digging of foundations and the retention of trees.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, the appeal is successful.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR