



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14TH June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/23/3331428

Morine House, 181D Squires Lane, London N3 2FA

- 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 A Rexha against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 23/3489/FUL, dated 10 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 06 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a roof extension to provide a studio flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The address in the banner has been taken from the Council's Decision Notice, and appeal form. This is because the address on the application form is incorrect and includes the wrong post code for the site.
3. Since the decision was made by the Council, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published (19 December 2023). This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.
4. The appellant has provided a signed Unilateral Undertaking (UU), dated 4th March 2024 which, in summary, would prohibit prospective occupiers of the development from obtaining a parking permit. The Council have confirmed that the UU addresses their concerns set out in their second reason for refusal, which cited insufficient information in relation to the impact of the development on on-street parking and the local highway network. I am satisfied that this addresses the Council's concerns in respect of the second reason for refusal.

Main Issue

5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a three-storey, mid-terraced apartment building, of recent construction. The building is positioned between a row of two-storey terraced dwellings, and a larger, prominent three storey building, No.181 Squires Lane (No.181), which is located on the corner of Squires Lane and Long Lane. The

appeal building appears as flat roofed, with its overall height set just below the eaves of No.181. Its height and design allows for views of the roof slope and large chimney stacks of No.181 when approaching along Squires Lane towards the Long Lane junction from the southwest. Surrounding buildings are generally of traditional design, form and palette of materials. Their form comprise pitched roofs which slope away from Squires Lane which provides a degree of uniformity in the streetscene. The scale, design and materials of the appeal building sits comfortably between its more traditionally designed neighbours, and has been successfully integrated into the street scene.

7. The extension includes an asymmetrical roof design, with shallow pitch and use of more contemporary materials. This would result in a stark contrast with the more simple roof forms of its neighbours. The side profile of the roof would appear imbalanced, with much of it's bulk positioned to the rear, contrasting with the more balanced and symmetrical visible roof forms in the immediate area. While the overall height of the extension would be set below the ridge height of No.181, the resultant eaves would be taller which would erode the existing visual hierarchy between the buildings. I note that close views would be largely obscured due to the set back and shallow roof pitch. However, the extension would be highly visible when viewed along Squires Lane from the southwest. From this aspect, the incongruity of the extension would be apparent appearing as an unsympathetic addition within the surrounding streetscape. Furthermore, the extension would diminish the existing unbroken views towards the side roofscape of No.181, which are dominant on this vista.
8. I am mindful that the design has been altered from that which was previously considered at appeal¹. While the scale and bulk has been reduced, for the reasons set out, I am of the view that the revised proposals would remain harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In any event, I have considered the amended proposals on its merits.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012); Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012); and, D3 of The London Plan (2021). Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver sustainable development that is of high-quality design which respects the local context. The development also conflicts with the guidance contained within the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: The Residential Design Guide (2016) which requires new residential development to respond to the distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context.

Other Matters

10. I note that the scheme would deliver housing which would contribute towards meeting housing targets, and would represent an efficient use of land. The delivery of homes, and the effective and efficient use of a brownfield site, are clear benefits of the proposals which would attract significant weight. However, the benefits would be limited to a single dwelling and I do not consider that this

¹ Reference APP/N5090/W/20/3245802

would outweigh the clear adverse harm to the character and appearance of the area which would arise.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR