



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/25/3372242

20 The Drive, London NW11 9SR

- 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 Sam Denciger against the decision of Barnet London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/2173/HSE.
 - The development proposed is for a part single, part two storey side and rear extension following demolition of garage. Construction of loft extension including rear dormer and insertion of 2no roof lights to front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a bay fronted semi-detached house, with a detached garage located to its south west there is a reasonable gap between the host dwelling and the boundary shared with 24 The Drive.
4. I noted on my site visit that many dwellings within the locality have been altered and extended over time, in a multitude of ways. I acknowledge that 2no permitted development schemes have been deemed lawful by the Council, meaning that the appellant could implement a large wraparound loft dormer; and 2no 6m rear extensions. Whilst these quite clearly create a fall-back position, the nature of these proposals are materially different to that which is before me and therefore I only give them moderate weight in the planning balance.
5. The appeal scheme seeks to provide additional living space for the appellant, however with respect, the design appears to be a case of form following function and the cumulative impact that all of the extensions would have upon the host dwelling would be significant.
6. The Council's Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (October 2016) (SPD) stipulates that side extensions should not be more than half the width of the original house and that their front walls should be set back normally by 1m. Not only would the main range of the dwelling and its roof be extended, a second tier side extension with crown roof is also proposed, which

would be at the same height as the proposed box dormer to the rear roof slope; this combined with the 2 storey rear extension (also with a crown roof) and the single storey rear extensions would render the proposal contrived in its appearance.

7. I acknowledge that with regard to the side extension and other elements of the proposal that the SPD sets out guidelines, as opposed to absolute rules, but nonetheless they do provide a useful guide to what is deemed acceptable and constitutes good design within the borough. Whilst there may be a wider gap to the side of the house, that does not mean that it needs to be largely filled; and whilst I acknowledge that in some cases a degree of flexibility is reasonable, at 65% of the original house's width, I consider that that is quite a substantial increase.
8. The two stepped front elevation of the proposed side elevation would reduce the overall massing of the scheme, however it cannot be viewed in isolation and would clearly imbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings as a whole. Respectfully, I cannot agree that the side extension would respond sensitively to the local character and building form of the area. It does not appear that the Council are objecting to a two storey side extension per se, but it is the overall width that they find objectionable and to which I agree. I accept that the fallback position in respect of the wraparound dormer would be unfortunate, however overall in terms of scale and massing its overall impact would be far lesser than that now proposed.
9. I acknowledge that the rear extension, specifically the first floor element, would not be visible from the public realm, but nonetheless it forms part and parcel of the overall scheme and its significant width is attuned to that of the side extension. Further, I have been provided with no evidence that crown roofs are a traditional feature on the appeal property and combined with the proposed roof dormer would appear incongruent to overall character and appearance of the area, which includes the rear garden scene.
10. All in all the proposal would give rise to an overdevelopment of the host dwelling and I find that it would result in an incongruous and insubordinate series of additions that would fail to respect the appearance and proportions of the original building, giving rise to a significantly imbalanced pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part, harmful to the surrounding area. As well as conflicting with the SPD, the proposal is also contrary to policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), and policies CDH01 and CDH05 of The Barnet Local Plan (adopted March 2025) which together require local context to be enhanced by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness and be of high quality with architecture that pays attention to detail, expecting development proposals to compliment the character of the existing building particularly in terms of style, form and materials whilst ensuring that proposals for extensions are subordinate to the existing building and incorporate a roof profile that is sympathetic to it.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey INSPECTOR