
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by R Lankshear BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3233943

39 Edgeworth Crescent, Hendon, London NW4 4HA

- 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 P Halai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/1589/HSE, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed single storey side extension, first floor side extension, roof modification to create loft conversion with new rear dormers and associated internal alterations at 39 Edgeworth Crescent, Hendon, NW4 4HA'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3233941) on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling within a predominantly residential area. The dwelling is situated on the outside of a bend in the road in an elevated position compared to properties to the west, resulting in a wider and more visible plot than generally observed within the street scene. The property sits at the end of a row of similarly designed properties and whilst there is some degree of variety in terms of house design, the street scene largely comprises of hipped roofed two storey dwellings.
5. The development proposed would enlarge the roof of the dwelling with a partially hipped crown roof that would be the height of the existing tallest ridge of the host dwellinghouse. The enlarged roof would include three rooflights to the front and two dormer windows to the rear. The proposal would also introduce a single storey side extension to the west of the property and a first floor side extension to the east.

6. Whilst there is some variety in dwelling form and style within the wider area, the roofs in the road are predominantly hipped, which adds positively and distinctively to the character of the area. The existing roof design with subordinate hipped roofs to the highest part of the ridge, appears proportionate to the host dwelling and is reflective of the majority of other properties within the immediate street scene.
7. Whilst the proposal would not increase the maximum ridge height of the dwelling, the introduction of a roof of the size and form proposed, including from its increased width from the first floor side extension, would become a dominant feature of the host property. When considered cumulatively, the proposal and resultant increase in visual massing, particularly from the proposed alterations to the roof, would appear as large and bulky additions that fail to respect features or proportions of the host dwelling. The harm resulting from the increased mass of the dwelling would not be mitigated by the modest hips to the roof proposed and compounded by the width of the side extensions.
8. Furthermore, it would represent a prominent, discordant form of development that would not reflect the predominant roof form evident within the wider street scene in terms of its shape, style or proportions. Taken together these factors demonstrate that the proposal would represent an inappropriate design that would not be acceptable in its context, particularly owing to its bulk and form. It would neither be subordinate to the existing dwelling nor respect its features or those of the surrounding street scene.
9. I acknowledge that the first floor side extension would be set in from the boundary and setback from the front of the dwelling as suggested within the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD). The appellant also indicates that appropriate matching materials would be used and front bay retained. However, none of these matters outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host property and area identified above.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions in the locality although I am not fully aware of the particular circumstances or planning history of each individual case. From the evidence before me and my site observations, none of the other roof alterations have resulted in a roofscape of a commensurate form and size and as such I am not convinced that the proposal would reflect or assimilate with the character of the area. In any event I must consider the appeal scheme on its merits and the existence of other roof extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified above.
11. I conclude that the appeal development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such it would be contrary to the character and appearance aims of policies CS1 and CS5 of the adopted Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012; policy DM01 of the adopted Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), that seek, amongst other things, that development should represent high quality design and should preserve or enhance local character; and the National Planning Policy Framework including the design aims of paragraph 127 and the guidance contained within the adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD 2016.

Other Matters

12. The appellant contends that the proposed side extension would maximise a currently underutilised area to the side of the property, as well as detailing no objections were received to the planning application and that the Council did not find harm with regard to living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. Whilst noting all the comments raised, none of these matters alter or outweigh my conclusion with regard to the main issue.

Conclusion

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

Robert Lankshear

INSPECTOR