
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2016

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 4th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3157812
1 Calton Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1BY

- 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 Neil Wright against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/2424/HSE, dated 19 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side/rear extension with cat slide roof to the rear elevation. Loft conversion involving hip to gable end extension, 3no. rooflights to the front elevation and 2no. rear dormer windows at the first and second floor levels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side/rear extension with cat slide roof to the rear elevation, loft conversion involving hip to gable end extension, 3no. rooflights to the front elevation and 2no. rear dormer windows at the first and second floor levels at 1 Calton Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1BY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref:16/2424/HSE, dated 19 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 9112-PL-01 Rev P1 (Incorporating Site location Plan); 9112-PL-02 Rev P1; 9112-PL-03 Rev P1; 9112-PL-04 Rev P1; 9112-PL-05 Rev P1 and 9112-PL-06 Rev P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of application Ref 16/2424/HSE from that contained on the application form to 'a first floor side/rear extension with cat slide roof to the rear elevation, loft conversion involving hip to gable end extension, 3no. rooflights to the front elevation and 2no. rear dormer windows at the first and second floor levels'. This is a more simple and accurate description of the proposed development which I have therefore used in the determination of this appeal.
-

3. The Officer's Report refers to the fact that the submitted drawings contain errors and omissions which is disputed by the appellant. I have no evidence to indicate the nature or extent of any such errors or omissions and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the drawings and supporting information submitted with the application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises an end terraced dwelling with hipped roof in a block of three, with its side elevation facing the rear boundaries of properties on Netherlands Road. An existing single storey side extension adjoins the front facade of the property and projects approximately 3.7m beyond the rear elevation.
6. The area in the vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by predominantly mature semi-detached two storey dwellings set in relatively long rear gardens. There are numerous examples nearby of properties that have hip to gable roof extensions and a variety of rear and side roof dormer extensions. These display wide variations in design, scale, mass and use of construction materials which, in some cases, have little design relationship to each other. As a consequence there is a degree of inconsistency in the character and appearance of the roofs and rear of the properties in the vicinity.
7. I appreciate that many of the existing roof extensions may have been carried out as permitted development or under different planning policies that exist now. Nevertheless, no matter how they were granted planning permission, they are there and as such set the visual context for considering this appeal scheme.
8. The proposed development would result in a first floor extension over the existing ground extension and the conversion of the hipped roof to a gable. The rear part of the roof would take the form of a cat slide roof in which a roof dormer and first floor dormer would be inserted. The proposed roof dormer would be set slightly below the ridge of the roof, set in from the sides of the proposed roof and set slightly behind the eaves with fenestration to match the existing features of the rear of the house. Its design would be similar to the existing dormer at No 3 Calton Road. The first floor dormer would also be set in from the sides of the proposed roof and its flat roof would be approximately level with the existing eaves of the property. There would be no material change in the footprint of the existing property.
9. Although the proposed extension would result in a first floor addition over the existing ground floor extension, owing to the existing scale and mass of the terraced block that contains the appeal property, in views from Calton Road I consider that the proposed extension can be accommodated as an addition to the block without appearing as being over bulky and without unacceptably unbalancing of the block. The hip to gable roof would be characteristic of the design of several similar roof extensions that exist in the locality and therefore would not appear incongruous. The proposed rooflights would have no material impact on the appearance of the dwelling. Overall, in views from

Calton Road, I do not consider that the proposed development would cause any substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area.

10. The proposed cat slide roof appears to be an unusual feature in the locality but that does not necessarily imply that it would be visually unacceptable. Owing to the position of No 24 Netherlands Road and the extensive planting in its side and rear garden, it would not be possible to see the rear cat slide roof in public views from surrounding streets.
11. Whilst it would be visible from the rear of properties on Netherlands Road and Dalmeny Road these would be relatively intermittent distant views given the long intervening gardens and existing planting. In such views the proposed rear extensions and roof would be seen in the context of a variety of roof and dormer extensions that already exist in the locality. Whilst the proposed roof dormer would marginally occupy more than half the width of the extended roof, I consider that its scale and proportion would be appropriate in the overall context of the extended building. Consequently, I do not consider that the proposed rear roof elements would appear unduly prominent or incongruous.
12. In this case, given the end-terraced position, the varied character of the surroundings, the fact that the ridge of the terrace as a whole is retained and the availability of only limited views are material considerations which, in combination, are of sufficient weight to outweigh the related guidance in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide (SPD). I recognise that this proposal is larger than the examples provided by the Council in the SPD. However, given the locational and design factors in this case, I consider that the appeal proposal constitutes the circumstance where larger dormers would be acceptable. Consequently, I do not consider that this proposal materially conflicts with the relevant guidance in the SPD.
13. Taking the above matters into account, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not therefore conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies Document (2012). These policies, amongst other things, require that development displays a high quality design that contributes to the creation of a quality environment and preserves local character and respects the scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding development.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition concerning the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR