



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3336766

72 Sturgess Avenue, Hendon, Barnet, London NW4 3TS

- 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 Rahman Saeed against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/3624/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey, semi-detached property with predominantly rendered elevations and red tiled roof. The dwelling occupies a corner plot. As such the two-storey side gable elevation addresses Sturgess Avenue, while the front elevation addresses a small crescent within the street. The two-storey gable is set away from Sturgess Avenue, from which projects a single-storey lean-to side projection which is built up to the edge of the pavement. A tall brick wall boundary encloses the rear garden space. A large dormer is occupies the rear roof slope which is built up to the side gable of the dwelling.
5. On the opposite side of the crescent is a dwelling which has a similar relationship with Sturgess Avenue to the appeal dwelling. The street includes a number of gables which face Sturgess Avenue. There is a degree of variety within its building line, although dwellings are generally set back from the street with front gardens and yards to the front, set behind low level boundaries. The spacing of two-storey dwellings away from the Sturgess Avenue provides for a degree of openness within the street. This is a prevailing

characteristic of the streetscene, with only a small number of single storey elements positioned at the back of the pavement.

6. The extension would be constructed above the existing single storey side lean-to and, as such, would be positioned immediately adjacent to the pavement edge. The extension would include a tall gable roof design set slightly lower than the height of the dwelling. This would add considerable mass to the dwelling when viewed from Sturgess Avenue. The height and position at the back of the pavement would therefore appear visually dominant within the street and out of character with its surroundings.
7. The extension would project beyond the existing two-storey building line of dwellings to the rear, and due to its height, would contrast significantly with the existing set back of dwellings within the street. The extension would erode this prevailing characteristic, and undermine the visual openness of the street when approaching the site from both directions. Furthermore, the extension would imbalance the relationship of properties which address the crescent, particularly the broad symmetry in form and siting with the dwelling directly opposite. As such, the extension would fail to appropriately assimilate into its surroundings.
8. I acknowledge that the existing dormer, due to its position and design, adds to the visual mass of the existing side gable. The proposed extension, to a degree, would help to disguise the mass of the dormer. I also acknowledge that the extension itself would be well proportioned with the existing dwelling. Nonetheless, the closer relationship of the extension to the street would be more prominent and dominant than the dormer, which is away from the street. In addition, the proportionality of the extension does not lessen the harmful effect of the extension to the streetscene due to its positioning. Therefore, these matters of design do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development has an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policies CSNPPF, 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. Together, amongst other things, these require that development achieve high-quality design which respects local context. The development also fails to adhere to the guidance contained within the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: The Residential Design Guide (2016) which seeks to avoid two-storey developments which protrude beyond existing building lines.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR