
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3245863

39 Marsh Lane, London, NW7 4QJ

- 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. J. Walsh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/5734/HSE, dated 14 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is renewal of approved application 15/0762/HSE with front and rear dormers for a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant described the proposed development, included in the application form, as 'a 'renewal' of a lapsed planning permission but with front and rear dormers for a loft conversion'. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the proposed development as, 'Roof extension involving new crown roof, raising of the ridge height, side and rear dormer window and 1no. front facing roof light' as this would appear to have been accepted by both parties and to my mind more accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a 2 storey semi-detached residential dwelling located on the inside of a shallow bend at a point where the downward slope of Marsh Lane begins to level out. Unusually for semi-detached properties, several pairs along the road, including the appeal site, are asymmetrical in design.
5. The appeal scheme would involve extensive changes to the roof. The raising of the ridge line would imbalance the appearance of the property in comparison with the height of its neighbour. The proposed raising of the ridge line has established a new context which allows for the development of a large dormer. Whilst this has been designed to accord with the Council's adopted guidelines, my understanding is that these require dormers to adhere to parameters determined by the dimensions of the existing house. The proposed dormer set

within an enlarged roof would be excessive in size when compared to the size of the neighbouring property and would be a dominant structure clearly visible from the adjacent road.

6. The raising of the ridge height, would result in the side dormer being a discordant feature in the street scene. Its impact would be accentuated by the location of the appeal site, which is clearly visible as one approaches the site descending Marsh Lane.
7. Whilst the appellant has identified that properties opposite the appeal site have velux windows and there are others in the area with roof extensions, I do not know the planning history of these and can only consider the proposals before me. Furthermore, I do not have the details of the lapsed planning permission which I understand involved alterations to the roof of the appeal site, although I understand that the scheme did not include roof dormers proposed in the current scheme.
8. Whilst I understand that the appellant requires more space for his family's personal needs, the structures would be permanent features and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
9. Underpinning policies CS5 of the Core Strategy (2012) and DM01 of the Development Management Policies (2012) is a presumption that new development should respect local character and respect the scale, mass and pattern of surrounding buildings. I conclude on this issue that the proposals would be contrary to these policies and would strike a discordant feature in the streetscene causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. For these reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR