
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2020

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3242121

67 Monks Avenue, New Barnet, Barnet, EN5 1DA

- 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 Aris Georgiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/4995/HSE, dated 11 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is roof extension involving hip to gable, rear dormer window with Juliette balcony and 3 no front facing roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description I have used above is taken from the appeal form and the Council's decision notice as they describe the development more comprehensively than the description given on the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to the southernmost dwelling in a pair of hip-roofed, semi-detached dwellings located on the western side of Monks Avenue. The western side of Monks Avenue, in the near vicinity of the appeal site between the junctions with Dalmeny Road and Northumberland Road, is predominantly characterised by hip-roofed semi-detached dwellings. Whilst there is some variety in the style and design of roofs along Monks Avenue as a result of hip-to-gable and large dormer extensions, the 4 semi-detached dwellings at nos 61 to 67 have retained a more balanced hip-roofed form that contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. Neither the proposed hip-to-gable extension, nor the large flat-roof rear dormer, would reflect the existing character of the main roof. These elements of the proposal would result in incongruous additions that would dominate the roof, fundamentally altering its shape and harmfully unbalancing the pair of semi-detached houses.

6. The hip-to-gable extension and, to a lesser extent the side of the rear dormer, would be visible in public views along Monks Avenue. As such, the development would appear discordant on the dwelling and would relate poorly to the existing hip-roofed profiles in the streetscene. Although matching materials are proposed for the dormer walls and the hip-to-gable extension, this would not overcome the adverse effect that I have described.
7. My attention has been drawn to other examples of unmatched pairs of semi-detached dwellings in the local area, many including hip-to-gable and large dormer extensions. The full circumstances leading to those developments are not before me and they do not form a reason, on their own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and have concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out.
8. The proposed development would, therefore, adversely affect the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016, Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012 (LP). Taken together, amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality, has regard to the form, function and structure of an area, is based on an understanding of local characteristics, does not undermine suburban character or local distinctiveness and respects local context. The proposal would also fail to accord with the relevant aims of the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 which states, in general, extensions should reflect the design of the original building, whilst having regard to the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. The Council advises that elements of the proposal may be capable of implementation under the provisions of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended). However, this is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act). It is open to the appellant to apply to have the matter determined under section 192 of the Act. Any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR