
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/17/3171948

10 Durham Road, East Finchley, London N2 9DN

- 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 and Mrs P Munday against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/6903/HSE, dated 24 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear roof dormer extensions to existing 2nd floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice does not set out the reasons for refusal of the application. I have, therefore, framed the main issues having regard to the conclusions of the officer's delegated report and the findings of my site visit.
3. The proposal includes the insertion of three rooflights in the front roof slope of the appeal property. The Council has not objected to this element of the proposal. I see no reason to disagree and have framed the main issues accordingly.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposed rear roof extensions on:
 - the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 12 Durham Road with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property is a mid-terrace two storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof space. A single storey extension has been added to the flat roofed two storey rear outrigger. The proposal would add a second floor over the full width and most of the depth of the outrigger. A further roof extension would span the full width of the rear slope of the main roof. This extension would spring from the eaves level of the existing roof and its flat roof would be just
-

- below the existing ridgeline. The flat roof of the extension over the outrigger would be slightly lower than that of the main roof extension.
6. Whilst the property is set back from the corner of Durham Road and Lincoln Road, the upper part of the rear of the building is visible from Lincoln Road. The proposed extensions would be prominent in this view as well as from the rear gardens of surrounding dwellings. By virtue of their height, width and the depth of the outrigger extension, they would not be subordinate to the host building. Most of the walls of the extensions would slope and be finished with tile hanging. This would help to reduce the bulk of the extensions somewhat, but would not be sufficient to prevent them from dominating the existing rear roof and outrigger. The sloping walls and tile hanging would also give the extensions a mansard appearance which is not characteristic of the area. Moreover, the side wall of the extensions facing towards Lincoln Road would be vertical and featureless.
 7. I recognise that the rear of No 6 has been extended at second floor level. However, that extension does not appear to be as bulky as the appeal proposal and is less prominent in public views from Lincoln Road. The appellant has also drawn my attention to planning permissions for extensions to 49 and 104 Huntington Road (application references 14/07414/HSE and F/0387/13 respectively). I have not been made aware of the full circumstances of those approvals. However, I saw on the site visit that No 49 is a mid-terrace property whose rear elevation cannot be seen in public views. No 104 is an end of terrace property and a second floor extension can be glimpsed from the road. It is not clear from the submitted information whether this is part of the application proposal referred to by appellant. Nevertheless, it is not as prominent in public views as the appeal proposal. Therefore, I consider that the cited extensions do not provide a robust justification for the appeal proposal.
 8. Consequently, I find that the proposed rear roof extensions would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such, they would conflict with Policy CS5 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM01 of its Development Management Policies 2012 (DMP). Together, these policies require development to respect local character in terms of scale, mass and height among other things. The proposed extensions would not accord with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015 to the extent that it requires proposals to be of the highest architectural quality and of a proportion and scale that enhances the public realm. Nor would they comply with Paragraph 14.33 of the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 insofar as it advises against dormer roof extensions which occupy more than half the width and half the depth of the existing roof.

Living Conditions

9. The vertical side wall of the outrigger extension is hard up against the common boundary with No 12. Fairly close to that boundary the main rear wall of this dwelling has a first floor window which appears to serve a room likely to be used for significant periods of the day. The extension would be to the south of this window. It would be almost a full storey height above the affected window and would project a considerable distance out from the main wall. Therefore, by virtue of its siting, height and depth, I consider that the outrigger extension

would significantly reduce the amount of light reaching the neighbouring window and would have an overbearing effect on the outlook from it. The proposal would, therefore, be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 12.

10. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with DMP Policy DM01 inasmuch as it requires proposals to allow for adequate daylight, sunlight and outlook for adjoining occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR