
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2019

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3235544

68 Woodlands, Golders Green, London NW11 9QU

- 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 David Joseph against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/2804/HSE, dated 16 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is to replace the existing hipped roof with a new mansard roof with dormer windows side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to replace the existing hipped roof with a new mansard roof with dormer windows side and rear at 68 Woodlands, Golders Green, London NW11 9QU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2804/HSE, dated 16 May 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: CST126-EX01 - Site location plan; CST126-EX02 - Existing site plan; CST126-EX03 - Existing ground floor plan; CST126-EX04 - Existing first floor plan; CST126-EX05 - Existing second floor plan; CST126-EX06 - Existing roof plan; CST126-EX07 - Existing front and rear elevations; CST126-EX08 - Existing sections; CST126-PL23 Revision B - Proposed second floor plan; CST126-PL25 Revision B - Proposed front and rear elevations; CST126-PL26 Revision B - Proposed side elevations.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 68 Woodlands lies in a residential area comprised mainly of detached and semi-detached houses. The buildings are of varied design, but there are repeated

design features, such as tile-hung bays, decorated gables and arched doorways, which provide some degree of shared character. There is also a degree of uniformity in the use of materials, with rendered walls and plain tiled roofs being predominant. Although some of the original houses are still largely intact, most have been significantly altered, particularly at ground floor level and through additions to the roofs. A range of flat-roofed dormers and other unorthodox roof forms feature in the street scene, so that the original harmony in the roofscape of the street has largely been lost.

4. The appeal property is one of those that has been significantly extended and altered. The bay window has been rendered and, if there was originally an arched entrance doorway, it has now been obscured by a flat roofed single storey extension at the front, which also wraps around the side of the house. There is also a flat-roofed single storey extension across the entire rear elevation. Large dormer windows have been added to the front, rear and northern side of the roof, which have largely obliterated its original form. The side dormer is a particularly incongruous addition, due to its scale, design and lack of any cohesion with the pre-existing roof structure. As a result, the house has lost much of its original character.
5. The proposal to provide an additional bedroom at second floor level involves the construction of a new mansard roof over the entire house. As a result of the steeper roof pitch, the front dormer would no longer be necessary, and would be replaced by two rooflights. There would also be a reduction in the width of the rear dormer. The wider span of the mansard would conceal a significant proportion of the northern side dormer behind the new front roof slope. The additional dormer proposed in the southern side of the roof would be set well back from the eaves and hips. As a result of the proposals, therefore, the mansard would be the dominant feature of the roof, with the dormers being more subservient than they are in the present arrangement.
6. Whilst a mansard roof would not reflect the original character of the house, much of that character has already been lost through the addition of the bulky dormers. The proposals would go some way to redressing this harm, by providing a more cohesive roof form, with a greater proportion of sloping roof, and a reduction in the dominance of flat-roofed dormers. I saw that other similar mansard-style roofs have been constructed in the immediate locality, or are currently being built, so the proposal would be one of a number of similar roofs in the road. Although the resultant roof would be a little higher, it would not be out of scale with the houses on either side, or the street scene in general.
7. The council has referred to its Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (the SPD), and in particular the advice it provides on dormer extensions. The SPD advises that dormers should be subordinate features on the roof, and they should not overlap or wrap around roof hips. The existing dormers do not comply with this advice. The proposals would remove the front dormer and reduce the dominance of the existing side and rear dormers. The proposed dormer on the south side elevation would not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof slope within which it would sit. I therefore see no conflict with the advice contained in the SPD.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the property or the surrounding area. Consequently, the

development would comply with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) (2012) and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) (2012). These policies seek to protect and enhance Barnet's character through high quality design.

Conditions

9. In accordance with the legislation I have imposed a condition limiting the period within which the development must commence. I have also included a condition specifying the relevant plans, as this provides certainty. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, a condition is required to specify that the materials to be used in the development must match the existing building.

Conclusion

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

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR