



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2024

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3339547

2 Bedford Road London NW7 4LU

- 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 Otunba against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 23/4340/HSE dated 9 October 2023 was refused by notice dated 12 January 2024.
 - The development sought is Part single part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension. Roof extension including hip to gable and rear dormer window .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Part single part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension. Roof extension including hip to gable and rear dormer window at 2 Bedford Road London NW7 4LU in accordance with the terms of the application dated 9 October 2023 and the drawings submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: AH735_04; AH735_05; AH735_06; AH735_07; AH735_08.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. 2 Bedford Road (No.2) is a two-storey semi-detached house located within a quiet suburban residential area dating from the middle decades of the twentieth century. The appeal site is a prominent corner plot at the junction with Worcester Crescent such that the side extension and gable would be widely seen. The design of the existing dwelling pair¹ incorporates a pair of projecting, asymmetric gables featuring oriel windows at upper floor level, with render finish, feature timbering, and in the case of No.2, a distinctive wrap-around window to the upper floor which acknowledges the corner location. Brickwork is used to the ground storey.
4. The proposal would incorporate a hip-to-gable extension into a gabled side extension that would increase the width of No.2 by around half of what is currently found. The dwelling pair of No.2, 4 Bedford Road (No.4), has a hip-to-

¹ No.2 with No.4 Bedford Road

- gable roof extension such that the proposal would introduce a degree of symmetry to the front elevation of the pair which is currently absent.
5. The Council point to the 'subordinate hipped roof' on the side extension of No.4 also that its extension is narrower 'resulting in a more appropriate massing to the rear' compared to the proposal. However, that comparison does not acknowledge that the rear of No.4 has been significantly extended with a full height dormer extension which towers over the two-storey rear projecting wing and its and its hipped roof as referred to.
 6. The design of the proposal has taken some care to incorporate fenestration that complements the original house design and although the flank wall will be apparent to passers-by, the extension is set back from the front elevation such that the corner window is retained. The Council suggest that although the proposal appears to accord with its guidance for residential extensions, they point to the combination of side and rear additions as over-development. However, in the context of what exists at No.4 and noting the relatively generous depth and width of the appeal site's plot and the effective softening and part screening in approach views provided by established trees, what is proposed would not appear to be cramped or excessive as there would remain some important separation between the new flank wall and the hedged side boundary.
 7. Overall, I find little conflict with Policies CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (Core Strategy); Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012) (BDMP) or the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016) which together seek that development should respect local context and protect local character and amenity.
 8. Consequently, for the reasons given and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing condition. As the approved plans make clear that the works would match what currently exists no materials condition is necessary.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR