The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2017

by Janet Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS

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

Decision date: 31st May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/17/3170394
First Floor, 15 Woodstock Avenue, London NW11 9RG

- 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 N Berlinger against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
- The application Ref 16/4236/FUL, dated 28 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
- The development proposed is to replace the existing roof with a mansard roof with dormers, in order to increase the size of the flat and create a duplex.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and of the area.

Reasons

3. There is some variety in the style and design of roofs along Woodstock Avenue with a number of properties having carried out roof extensions and alterations. The appeal property (a first floor flat) has a relatively simple hipped roof form with projections both front and rear from midway up the roof slope. The proposal would result in wholesale alterations to the roof increasing the pitch of the main roof on all four sides resulting in a flat roof with steep mansard sides within which five further flat roofed dormers would be added.

4. These alterations would significantly change the visual appearance of the property with the original roof subsumed to such an extent that none of its original form would be discernible. Despite the use of matching materials the pitch of the roof would be excessively steep, such that it would appear as a contrived and alien design feature in the street. These changes coupled with the number and size of dormer windows proposed would introduce dominant and incongruous features in the street scene which would be unduly prominent harming the appearance of the dwelling, the street scene and the area in general.

5. For these reasons the proposal would be in conflict with: Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012); to Policy CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (2012); Policies 7.4 and 7.6

of the Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) (the London Plan) and guidance contained within Barnet's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2013). These policies together seek to ensure high quality design, to ensure that extensions are subordinate to the main house, are in proportion and have an appropriate roof form.

Other matters

6. The applicant states the Council informed him that the plans were satisfactory and that the planning committee refused permission following an officer recommendation to approve the scheme. This is not borne out by the evidence from the Council which shows the decision followed a recommendation for refusal under delegated powers. I have no evidence before me which details a recommendation of approval nor had any papers to demonstrate what advice had been given. In any event I have considered this appeal on the evidence before me purely on its own merit.

Conclusion

7. In the light of the above points and considering all matters before me the appeal should be dismissed.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR