



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025

by **H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/24/3352935

16 and 18 Sinclair Grove, Golders Green, Barnet, London NW11 9JG

- 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 Bernard Waldman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 24/2024/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Part single, part two storey side and rear extensions following demolition of the existing garage and outbuildings and single storey front extension to both properties. Roof extension involving hip to gable, rear dormer window, raising ridge of existing gable feature and front facing rooflights
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council adopted a new Local Plan on 4 March 2025 and has confirmed that the policies from Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and Barnet's Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012) referred to in the Decision Notice have been superseded by policies from the Barnet Local Plan 2021-2036 (2025) (BLP).
3. Appeal decisions must be based on the policies from the development plan prevailing at the time of determination. Policies referred to in the reason for refusal, relating to the planning application subject to this appeal from the Barnet Local Plan 2012, are no longer relevant. Parties were provided with the opportunity to comment on the new policies in the context of this planning appeal and I have taken their comments into account. The Council has referred to Policies GSS01 and CDH04 of the BLP. However, these policies relate to delivering sustainable growth and tall buildings respectively so are not determinative to this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal properties are a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings in a predominantly residential area. Many of the nearby dwellings are of a similar design with front bays topped with a gable feature and a set back to the side. These are important characteristics of the area and give a regular rhythm to the street scene.

6. The dwellings have been the subject of a previous approval¹ which maintained the set back to the side extensions. The changes from the previous approval include bringing forward part of the first floor front section to remove a setback and increase the depth of the first floor as well as a change in the roof pitch over the side extensions.
7. Whilst the properties on the street are of a mix of architectural styles and design, those on the same side of Sinclair Grove have a similar setback, creating a regular pattern of development in the streetscene. This is the case even for dwellings that have been extended. The loss of this setback would reduce the architectural impact of the bays thus harming this important characteristic of the area.
8. In addition, the removal of the setback would make the dwellings appear wider and bulky in their plots, as well as not being consistent with the form of the original building. The extensions would not therefore appear as subordinate to the host dwellings and increase the prominence of the buildings in the streetscene.
9. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy CDH01 of the BLP and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which together, and amongst other matters, seek to ensure development responds sensitively to local character and design, building form, scale and massing.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would allow additional usability of the front corners of the properties and would provide additional living space for the occupiers. These matters carry limited weight in favour of the proposal. However, in this case, the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the host dwellings and the surrounding area would outweigh the benefits arising from the proposed development.
11. I have had regard to the submitted photographs and saw the flatted development close to the appeal site. However, I note that there are clear material differences between the proposal and the individual circumstances surrounding these examples. The photographs show examples of dwellings in surrounding streets and not in the same context as the appeal site. The flatted development differs from the appeal proposal with regard to its height, form and massing and that it is not a semi-detached property. In addition, I have determined the appeal on the site-specific circumstances of the site.

Conclusion

12. 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.

H Senior

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning ref- 23/5498/FUL