



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA C
Env Assoc RTPI

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3237403

15 Shirehall Close, Hendon, London, NW4 2QR

- 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 Jay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/3122/HSE, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the pitch of the roof, erection of rear dormer window and roof lights on the front and side elevations to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The Council states that on balance it considers the rear dormer element and rooflights to be acceptable. I do not disagree. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof pitch alterations upon the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 15 is a detached two-storey property located on the southern side of Shirehall Close. The surrounding area is residential, and its distinctive character is derived from predominantly hipped and gabled two-storey front bay windows and hipped, tile roofs. These are prominent features that create an appearance of a neat and unified street scene. There are a few examples where properties have been extended to the side, rear and in the roof, including at the properties that lie to the east. Nonetheless, in the main, hipped roofs where the pitch extends from that of their individual front gables are a distinguishing feature of the area. Notwithstanding some diversity therefore, the architectural integrity of the street scene remains largely intact.

5. The alterations to the roof pitch would involve the formation of a mansard roof which would substantially increase the mass and volume of the existing roof. It would also alter the slope of the roof to a steeper pitch that would appear at odds with the modest and consistent form of the prevailing hipped roofs in the locality. I note the approved scheme for dormers, however unlike the appeal proposal, these would be subordinate and unobtrusive features that would allow the hipped roof form and front gables to remain legible characteristics that contribute to the quality of the street scene. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposed mansard roof would appear overly dominant and disproportionate to the host property and its surroundings.
6. My attention is drawn to examples in neighbouring streets where properties have been extended at roof level, with alterations including increasing the angle/pitch of the roof or creating a new mansard roof. However, being in a different street, these other developments have not influenced the individual context of the appeal proposal which I have considered on its own merits. They do not therefore warrant the identified harm.
7. I note that there is no reference to mansard roofs within London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (2016) (the 'SPD'). However, an objective of the SPD is to ensure that extensions fit into the street, and where there is a consistent and coherent architectural character, the extension should not detract from it. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not comply with this advice.
8. I find that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, it would conflict with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) to achieve good design. It would also be contrary to Policy DM01(b) of the London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012) which amongst other things seeks to ensure that proposals preserve or enhance local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the evidence before me, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR