



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3231356

51 Park Hall Road, East Finchley, London N2 9PY

- 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 Belcher (Belcher Hall Associates) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/0660/HSE, dated 5 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is full width loft extension and extension to outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for full width loft extension and extension to outrigger at 51 Park Hall Road, East Finchley, London N2 9PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/0660/HSE, dated 5 February 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: Location plan; 234/05 Site block plan; 234/03 Plans as proposed; 234/04 Elevations and section as proposed.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The full width rear roof extension and front rooflights also shown on the plans did not feature in the reasons for refusal and I see nothing in the delegated report to indicate that there is any dispute between the parties over those works. I have no reason to disagree so I shall confine my considerations in this appeal to the dormer extension above the rear outrigger.
3. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the dormer extension above the rear outrigger on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the east side of Park Hall Road, which is characterised by traditional terraced properties with attractive frontages. To the rear, each property shares half of a pitched roof two-storey outrigger. A number of other dwellings on this side of Park Hill Road have large flat roof

rear dormer extensions, two of which also extend over the outrigger. The properties back onto a narrow unsurfaced lane, which provides access to the rear gardens and also those of the properties on Summerlee Avenue. The rear of the properties on Summerlee Avenue also contain numerous flat roof dormers.

5. Barnet's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) requires that dormers should normally be subordinate features and should not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof slope. In addition, the materials should be in keeping with the rest of the house.
6. Although dormer extensions above the outrigger are less common on this terrace, the proposal would sit considerably lower than the main roof extension and would not extend more than half the depth of the outrigger. It would be clad in tiles to match the existing and set against a party wall that would be stepped down in matching brick. As such, the development would be in keeping with the materials of the host building and would not be unduly bulky or dominating, both individually or cumulatively with the other parts of the proposal.
7. Moreover, even from the rear lane, the views of the dormer would be very limited because of the screening by the party wall of the appeal property, as well as from the outrigger and trees of No 49. Although it is likely to be visible from the rear of properties on Summerlee Avenue, this would be against the backdrop of the larger roof extension on the main roof of the host building and in the context of other properties with rear dormers. Consequently, the development would not appear visually obtrusive or incongruous.
8. In conclusion, the proposals would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It would comply overall in this regard with the aims and objectives of Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document 2012, Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012, and the SPD. Taken together, these seek development which is well designed and respects local context and character. The proposal also complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to respect existing character.

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 of the development to match the dwelling.

Conclusion

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

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR