
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3229265

2 Hillside, New Barnet, Herts EN5 1LU

- 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 Lanny Silverstone against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/0027/HSE, dated 21 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is alteration to roof involving 2no front dormer windows to replace existing rooflights. New WC to ground floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alteration to roof involving 2no front dormer windows to replace existing rooflights and new WC to ground floor front extension at 2 Hillside, New Barnet, Herts EN5 1LU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/0027/HSE, dated 21 December 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 082-1 B Site Location Plan; 082 03 B Proposed Floor Plan, Front Elevation and Section.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the walls of the ground floor extension and dormer roofs shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Hillside is a connecting residential street between Richmond Road and Gloucester Road. There is a wide variation in the age and style of properties in these streets. A number of properties on the west side of Hillside have one or

two front dormer windows, which are mostly flat roofed. The older pairs of semi-detached properties on the north side of Richmond Road have two pitched roof front dormers, except for No 41, which has a larger flat roof dormer. Some of the more modern houses further up Richmond Road have large front box dormers. As such, front dormer windows of different styles are a common feature of the local street scene.

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on the west side of the road, close to the junction with Richmond Road. It is prominent because of its location and the steep gradient. There is an existing flat roof dormer window positioned above the forward projecting roof slope and two rooflights in the main roof, which the proposal seeks to replace with two dormer windows.
6. The proposed dormer windows would be similar in their design and scale to the pitched roof dormers on Richmond Road, which they would be very close to. They would be well-proportioned subordinate elements, set considerably below the ridge. They would also be set a sufficient distance from the existing dormer to avoid appearing cramped with it. Even cumulatively with the existing dormer, they would not occupy a large proportion of the front roof slope and as such, would not appear cluttered, bulky or dominant on the roof. Accordingly, whilst the combined total of three front dormers would not be typical, the proposal would in overall terms, fit well within the varied context and would not be incongruous or obtrusive in the street scene, or on the host property.
7. The ground floor WC extension did not feature in the Council's refusal reasons and as it would be a modest and proportionate addition to the dwelling, I agree it is acceptable.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. It therefore accords in this regard with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012), and the Barnet Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Guidance (2016). Collectively, these seek development which is well designed and respects local context and character. Furthermore, it would accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. These are considered necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, I have also included a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the walls of the ground floor extension and dormer roofs to match the dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR