



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2024

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3341867

47 Sydney Grove, Hendon, Barnet, London NW4 2EJ

- 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 J Cooper against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 23/4873/HSE.
 - The development proposed is part single part two storey side and rear extensions and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling at the end of Sydney Grove, a residential street. While the surrounding properties have a number of extensions and alterations, the similarity in the general scale of the built form creates a sense of balance and a harmonious character and appearance that contributes positively to the area.
4. The ground floor extension would be wider than the existing property and be of a considerable depth. While other surrounding properties may well have deep single storey rear extensions, the appeal scheme with its excessive width would overly intensify the quantum of built form, filling the width of the plot almost entirely. The scale of the ground floor extension would appear as a dominant addition and in doing so would not be consistent with the form and scale of the existing property, as advised in the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD). While the single storey extension would not be readily apparent from public vantage points, this does not mean that an otherwise unacceptable development should be permitted.
5. The SPD sets out that dormer roof extensions can have a significant effect on the appearance of a house and their design needs careful consideration. The change in roof design from a hip to a gable is not in dispute and the proposed roof extension has been designed to maximise the usable space. However, the dormer would sit awkwardly towards the shared boundary with the neighbouring property. The position of the dormer, in combination with the first-floor infill addition would have a poor degree of integration with the

appeal property and owing to the bulk and massing of these additions they would unbalance the semi-detached pair. They would therefore draw the eye and stand out as being visually incongruous.

6. The appeal site occupies a quiet position at the end of the street with limited passing traffic. Nevertheless, and even if the full extent of the proposal would not generally be seen in public views from Sydney Grove, the bulky discordant additions to the rear elevation would be discernible in views from the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties on Sydney Grove. Furthermore, the side elevation would be apparent in filtered views from the gardens of Wykeham Road. In these views, the detrimental effect of the proposal would be readily apparent, despite the generous plot sizes.
7. Reference is made to extending the appeal property at the ground floor level through permitted development rights and extending the roof in line with a lawful development certificate, and this is a fallback position. I have no clear reason not to find a real prospect of the fallback development being implemented. Nonetheless, the fallback development differs from the appeal scheme. It is not as wide at the ground floor level, does not include a first-floor infill addition and does not extend the roof as far to the side, and so would not be as visually intrusive as the appeal scheme would be.
8. Accordingly, the differences between the fallback position and the appeal scheme are not insignificant, as suggested by the appellant. Moreover, the fallback development would not have the same effect on the character and appearance of the area as the appeal scheme would. I therefore find the suggested fallback position to have limited weight in the determination of the appeal as a consequence.
9. For the reasons given, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property, in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012). These policies require, amongst other things, that development respects local context and creates buildings of high quality design. In addition, it would be contrary to the guidance set out in the SPD regarding residential extensions.

Other Matter

10. I note the comments from an interested party with regard to the remaining garage. However, whether or not agreements are in place to secure the structural integrity of the garage is a private matter.

Conclusion

11. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that I should take a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR