

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3239173

14 Twineham Green, North Finchley, London N12 7EP

- 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 & Mrs Howard Segal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/4389/HSE, dated 7 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "First floor extension and two dormer additions."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension and two dormer additions at 14 Twineham Green, North Finchley, London N12 7EP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/4389/HSE, dated 7 August 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 258_P_001; 258_P_010; 258_P_020; 258_P_120; 258_P_220.
 - 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. The Council have not raised any concerns with regards to the proposed first floor extension. I have therefore assessed this appeal only on the proposed rear and side dormer extensions.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the two dormer additions on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The surrounding area is characterised by residential properties of predominantly detached and semi-detached styles. The appeal property is a large two storey dwelling with hipped roofs design. There is a mix of different

roof forms in the area and it is this variation which contributes to the character of the area.

5. The existing roof of the appeal property is large and would sufficiently accommodate the two dormer windows at the scale proposed. The proposed dormers would be set in from the edges of the roof and would be subordinate to the existing property and not appear disproportionate within the surrounding setting.
6. There are a number of dormer extensions within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The proposed dormer windows would be similar in size, design and position to these other dormer extensions and they would not be bulky features that would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. Paragraph 14.33 of the Barnet Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 (SPD) provides specific advice on design, scale and proportions for proposed dormer windows. The proposals would contradict some of the advice in paragraph 14.33 of the SPD as the dormer extensions would rely on using existing side and rear extensions, occupy more than half the width and half the depth of the existing roof slope, and the proposed windows would not align with windows below. The proposed rear dormer would be predominantly screened from public viewpoints with the proposed side dormer extension being modest in size and would not be a prominent feature. The proposals would not be dissimilar to other existing dormers in the area and I remain satisfied that the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area would not be adversely compromised.
8. Whilst there would be some breach of the requirements of paragraph 14.33 of the SPD, for the reasons above I conclude that there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area. The proposal would be in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM01 of the Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 which seeks development to be of high quality design, create a quality environment and protect and enhance character.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition relating to materials in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area. In the interests of safeguarding the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, the Council have requested conditions restricting further openings and installation of obscure glazing. These conditions are neither necessary or appropriate.

Conclusion

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

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR