



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2019

**by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 September 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/19/3221532**

**Flat 3, 254-256 Watford Way, London NW4 4UJ**

- 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 Shiraz Dhanji against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 18/6307/FUL, dated 11 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
  - The development proposed is extension to roof including infill extension to existing 2 no. rear dormer windows.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to roof including infill extension to existing 2 no. rear dormer windows at Flat 3, 254-256 Watford Way, London NW4 4UJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/6307/FUL, dated 11 October 2018, 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: Drawing No 1 Location Plan, No 5 Proposed Plan of Attic Flat 3, and No 6 Proposed Rear Elevation;

3) 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.

### Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of development given on the decision notice as this more accurately and precisely describes the appeal proposal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a studio flat within the roof space of the large crescent shaped two storey building on the corner of Greyhound Hill/Watford Way (A1).
5. The appeal property has two, flat roofed, rear dormers that face the roof of a ground floor car showroom premises and other neighbouring extensions, onto a narrow service road.
6. These dormers are small, both about 2.75 metres in width and each contain a window. The proposed development involves infilling the gap between the dormers. The result would be the creation of a larger single dormer, with four windows, all the same height and with overall resultant width of about 8.3 metres.
7. The appeal property forms part of a much larger building which has a single roof spanning a length of around 95-100 metres. I note from my visit that different sections of the rear roof now have a mix of finishing materials, a likely consequence of multiple ownership.
8. The Council states that the existing dormers are a 'subordinate feature' of the roof. I agree with this view and was able to see on my visit that the dormers were proportionate in scale and that they did not dominate the roof space.
9. The infill dormer would remain the same breadth and height, and continue to carry a flat roof. Widening each dormer by about 1.5m, so that they join, would not be excessive, particularly in relation to the size and scale of the original building's roof. The resulting dormer would not occupy more than half of the width or depth of that roof slope. I consider that in design terms the proposal would reflect the existing dormers, would remain subservient in scale to the host building, and would not be incongruous or unsympathetic in its wider context.
10. The character and appearance of the front of the building contrasts with the rear elevation. Unlike the more pleasing front elevation, the rear has no uniformity with various physical protrusions/extensions at first and ground floor levels and including air conditioning units, metal flue ducting, and dish antennae. There are very limited views of the rear elevation from the public realm, if any. Overall, and in this context, I do not consider that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property, or the area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012; Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012; and Section 14 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016. Amongst other things, these require a high standard of design, and a scale of development, appropriate to the host building and local context, including where a proposal involves properties converted into flats.

## Conditions

12. It is necessary to impose the standard time condition and an approved drawings condition, in the interests of certainty. In the interests of good design

and the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a condition on materials.

**Conclusion**

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

*Euan FS Pearson*

INSPECTOR