



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3349819

19 Parsons Crescent, Edgware, Barnet HA8 8QG

- 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 Ben Sandground against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 24/1651/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and a first floor side / rear wrap around extension, with a rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The properties in Parsons Crescent are two storeys high, semi-detached or detached, and set back from the carriageway. Seen from the road, most have a fairly cohesive appearance with a principally hipped roofed form and full height bay windows. To the rear, their form and proportions are more varied as a result of extensions, and I observed, for instance, that some properties close to No 19 have single storey rear projections and dormer windows.
4. The Barnet Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 ('SPD') advises that extensions should appear subordinate to, and should respect, the original house, having regard to matters such as roof form, proportions, scale and style, and that they should not appear overly dominant. It also states that dormer extensions should be subordinate features which do not occupy more than half the width, or half the depth, of the roof slope.
5. The host forms one half of a semi-detached pair, whose general form and style are typical of the road, and which has a single storey flat-roofed projection to the side and on part of its rear face.
6. Whilst the proposed first floor extension would be set back from the host's front face, given that its ridge would be at the same height, it would not achieve a fully subordinate appearance. Moreover, cumulatively with the proposed hip to gable conversion, the gabled side extension would significantly increase the property's bulk.

7. No 17 Parsons Crescent ('No 17') has a side extension, but its first floor has a hipped roof which is set down from the ridge, thus achieving a subordinate appearance, and it respects the form and style of this pair. By contrast, the appeal scheme would have a greater bulk, and a form which would be markedly at odds with the host and No 17. The scheme would thereby disrupt the balance of this pair, and the resultant property would appear overly dominant, and at odds with the streetscene's prevailing character.
8. The rear dormer would cover most of the extended building's roof which would thereby take on a broadly three storey appearance. Although the appellant refers to approved dormers in the wider area, considered cumulatively with the crown roof over the first floor rear extension, little of this original dwelling's form or style would be discernible; and the resultant property would jar with the simpler form and proportions of No 17 and other nearby properties on Parsons Crescent. That impact would be apparent from nearby properties, and adds to the harm that I have found would be caused to the streetscene.
9. The host benefits from a Certificate of Lawful Development for a hip to gable extension and a rear dormer (Ref: 23/2534/192). However, compared to it, these roof extensions would be significantly larger and more harmful. As illustrated by the drawings at page 3 of the appeal statement, the roof level bulk of this scheme would also be much greater than the extensions previously permitted at appeal (Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3336602), and which involved a side to rear extension with a hipped roof, which respected the original building's form and style.
10. My attention has also been drawn to approved development in the area, including extensions at 86 Wolmer Gardens and 49 Francklyn Gardens. However, those properties are not visible from here, and on the basis of my visit and the evidence before me, no nearby houses in Parsons Crescent have been so overwhelmed by extensions as would be the case here.
11. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 ('LP'), Policy CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2012, and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) 2012. In broad terms, and amongst other things, these require high quality design, which preserves or enhances local context and character, with regard to matters such as appearance, scale and mass. It would also conflict with the stance in the SPD.
12. Given that it would make an effective use of the land and result in a modest contribution to the local economy and improved living conditions, the scheme finds support from parts of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework. However, as the Framework only supports well-designed upward extensions, which are consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the streetscene, the scheme does not comply with its paragraph 124(e), nor with its environmental objective.
13. The scheme's limited benefits would not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause. It would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR