

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2016

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 19 October 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3156376**

**147 Arlington Road, Southgate, London, N14 5BA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Greenberg against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 16/2737/HSE, dated 22 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is a front dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front dormer at 147 Arlington Road, Southgate, London, N14 5BA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/2737/HSE, dated 22 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  2. 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.
  3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SA6/AR/1000, 2000, 3000, 4000, 5000 & 6000.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is small single storey dwelling and is something of an anomaly in an area which is characterised by two storey terraced and semi-detached suburban dwellings. The appeal proposal is as described above and would improve the bedroom accommodation at the loft level which is presently served by roof lights.
-

4. The Council is concerned that the dormer window by reason of its design, size and siting would be overbearing, visually obtrusive and detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing house and the wider locality.
5. Dormer windows are not a characteristic of the area. However, as I touch on above the appeal property is at variance from the norm; as well as the height and scale difference it is flat fronted and most local homes are bay windowed. The dominant features locally are the grander terraces, because of their scale and form and also because, to the north east, they are on higher ground. The addition of a dormer would not change that relationship or visual ranking. An attractive footway tree to the front of the appeal property leads to further diminution of the appeal property in the street scene. Whilst the planned dormer would not align with fenestration below it would be logically centred on this modest fully hipped roof. It would be constructed with a pitched roof and suitable cheeks and be in scale with the property as a whole. The height would be unusually elevated up to the main property ridge but sufficient surrounding pitched roof would remain on three other sides to visually compensate for this. In my opinion the scheme would not be jarring on the eye or aesthetically discordant.
6. Policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012) and Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy DPD (2012), taken together and amongst other matters, call for suitably scaled good quality design sympathetic to a property and its wider setting and ensuring protection of local distinctiveness and character generally. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies. Furthermore, there would not be conflict with the objectives of the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD (2013) which reflects these policy aims and could not be expected to cover every eventuality.

#### *Conditions*

7. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans as this provides certainty.

#### *Overall conclusion*

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

*D Cramond*  
INSPECTOR