



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3348411

25 Southway, Totteridge, London N20 8EB

- 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 and Mrs Ashish and Nisha Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application reference is 24/1263/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear and 2-storey side extension to a detached residence property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear and 2-storey side extension to a detached residence property at 25 Southway, Totteridge, London N20 8EB in accordance with the terms of the application, 24/1263/HSE, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule of this decision.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house with a single storey side projection within a mainly residential area. It occupies a good-sized corner plot at the junction between Southway and Greenway, along which 2-storey dwellings predominate. I saw that several properties close to the site have been externally altered and extended. There is, therefore, some variety to the existing built form in the area to which the site belongs.
4. The Council appears to raise no objection to the proposed ground floor rear addition, the rear dormer and the changes sought to the fenestration of the appeal dwelling. From the submitted evidence, I have no reason to disagree with those findings. Therefore, I shall focus on the new 2-storey side addition.
5. The first floor of the proposed side extension would be set back from the main body of the host building and the ground floor below. Like the existing dwelling, it would incorporate a hipped roof that would angle away from the adjacent roads with a ridge that would be noticeably lower than that of the main house to accentuate its subservience. Although taller and more substantial than the existing ground floor side projection that is to be partly replaced, the proposal would still be a proportionate addition. It would be

appropriate in design and materials with the pattern of windows to complement the host building. Taken together, these features would ensure that the new side extension, and the development as a whole, would relate reasonably well to the scale and style of the host building.

6. From what I saw, the existing side projection of No 25 establishes a substantial built form at ground floor level close to the site's side boundary, beyond which is a tall boundary wall and Greenway. This side projection also steps forward of the front building line of 44 Greenway, which is a residential property just beyond the rear of the site, as does part of the main 2-storey house. Due to the sloping ground, the existing side projection occupies an elevated position relative to the road and No 44. Consequently, it is a notable feature within the streetscape on the approach to the site along Greenway from the east.
7. By introducing additional built form, the proposal would reduce the sense of space between the first floor of the completed dwelling and the road. The first-floor element of the appeal scheme would also project forward of the frontage to No 44. This arrangement would conflict with that part of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Design Guidance* (SPD), which states that first floor extensions on corner sites should not project beyond the building line of adjoining roads.
8. However, No 25 already projects beyond the front build line of No 44, and the existing side projection has a strong visual presence in the streetscape. As such, the pattern of dwellings further along Greenway, which are set back from the road, and the spacious feel within the street scene have already been disrupted. As the proposal would not be significantly closer to the road than the existing side projection, and the design of the new first-floor component includes a set back and a hipped roof to preserve openness, it would not have a discernible effect on the character and qualities of the streetscape.
9. I observed that several other properties on corner plots along Greenway and Southway extend beyond the front of neighbouring properties on their return frontages. While some of these cases were not as prominent in their street scene as would be the case here, they nonetheless indicate that the new 2-storey side extension, as proposed, would not be an uncharacteristic or a discordant addition to the local area.
10. For all these reasons, the proposed development would not be incongruous, nor would it unduly disrupt the rhythm and building line of the adjacent dwellings along Greenway. On that basis, a conflict with the advice in the Council's SPD in this case is insufficient reason to withhold planning permission.
11. Overall, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policy CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) or the principles underpinning the Council's SPD. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development represents high quality design, preserves or enhances local character and respects the pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external materials of the extension match the existing building, as proposed, to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 215, 212 Rev A, 213 Rev A, 214 Rev A, 215 Rev A, 216 Rev A, 217 Rev A, 218 Rev A, 219 Rev A, 220 Rev A, 221 Rev A and 200 Rev A.
- 3) 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.