

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2024

by B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3341166

53 Flower Lane, Mill Hill, Barnet, London, NW7 2JN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adefemi Adewole against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 23/4740/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Two storey side and first floor rear wrapped around extension, incorporating raising of roof ridge and rear roof dormer extension including installation of two rooflights to front roofslope.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has referred to an emerging Local Plan at examination. I have not been provided with the emerging Local Plan. I have determined this appeal with reference to policies from the existing adopted development plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of 53 Flower Lane and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 53 Flower Lane (No 53) is a detached dwelling, located on a prominent corner plot in an established residential area. Flower Lane consists of a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. The properties on Flower Lane and Parkmead Gardens are set back significantly from the highway and consequently the area has an open character. The dwellings have driveways which provide spaces for off road parking.
5. The design of the appeal property correlates to the design of properties located on Parkmead Gardens as well as the immediately neighbouring properties. These properties have a pleasant character and relationship with one another. However, the proposed development would result in a side elevation that would disrupt the building line on Parkmead Gardens and in particular, project further than the side elevation of 7 Parkmead Gardens. This

would be further exacerbated by the two-storey nature of the proposed development as well as the wraparound design of the first-floor rear extension and side extension. The overall bulky nature of the proposal would result in an incongruous feature within the streetscene and harm the open and spacious character of the surrounding area, especially when viewed from Parkmead Gardens.

6. The appellant has attempted to ensure the proposal accords with paragraphs 14.13 and 14.25 of the Barnet Local Plan Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (the Residential Design SPD). Paragraph 14.25 states that in some circumstances larger rear extensions may be acceptable subject to the development adhering to principles of good design. However, 14.13 states that an extension should, amongst other things, avoid '*...protruding beyond prominent building lines.*'. Therefore, whilst the development would respect the front elevation with a set back and the roof would be set down from the original main ridge height of the dwelling, it would still fail to respect the relationship of the appeal site and the building line of Parkmead Gardens.
7. Whilst I acknowledge that the side extension is less than half the width of the original house, the appeal scheme would nevertheless project beyond the established building line on Parkmead Gardens and past a prominent corner. Consequently, the proposal also fails to accord with paragraph 14.19 which states that '*First floor extensions on corner sites should not project beyond the building line of the adjoining road*'. Therefore, despite the appellant's efforts in regard to design, the proposal would still result in harm to the character and appearance of the open character of the surrounding area.
8. In conclusion, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of No 53 and the surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policy CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2012 and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) DPD 2012. Both of which seek, amongst other things, to ensure developments are of a high level of design and that they respect their local contexts. Additionally, the development does not accord with the Residential Design SPD which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure development is of a high level of design. Furthermore, the development also fails to accord with the aim of the National Planning Policy Framework in achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

B Astley-Serougi

INSPECTOR