

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

**by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19<sup>th</sup> October 2020

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/20/3253936**

**Hadley Hotel, 113 Hadley Road, Potters Road to Hadley Common, Barnet  
EN5 5QN**

- 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 Executive Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref 19/5958/FUL, dated 1 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2020.
  - The development proposed is mansard roof extension to provide additional floor at third floor level with front, side and rear windows.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development provided by the appellant on the appeal form rather than the planning application, as this more accurately describes the proposed development. I have also taken the company name of the appellant from the appeal form, rather than the application form, to accurately reflect the company name.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site contains a 3 storey building located on Hadley road and it is currently operating as a hotel. The site is located on a prominent corner being on the junction with Tudor Road. The road outside the property has a steep slope with houses and their roofs being staggered up and down the road. The existing building features a front porch and a single storey rear extension and an existing basement. To the rear of the property there is a car parking area which is accessed from Tudor Road. The surrounding area is predominately residential and is characterised by 2 storey properties, which are a mixture of different semi-detached and detached dwellings.
5. The proposal would extend the roof to provide an additional floor to create a fourth floor level, and it would accommodate additional guest rooms. It would be in a mansard roof style and have front, side and rear windows.

6. Although the proposed mansard roof extension would only increase the height by one extra floor level, the building is already higher than most of the nearby properties. Therefore, it would introduce massing and height which would be in stark contrast to the existing street scene. The additional mass of the proposal would be apparent due to the steep angle of the mansard roof.
7. Due to the location of the property on a prominent corner and the slope of the road outside the property, the proposal would be readily visible within the street scene. It would draw the eye and appear as an incongruous addition to the host property and surrounding area and would disrupt the staggered nature of the existing street scene and would significantly harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
8. I note that the appellant has sought to introduce a scheme which would respect the original building. I also acknowledge that there are a variety of roof forms and styles along the road. Nevertheless, the proposal would be readily visible and would appear as a dominating feature within the street scene.
9. The appellant has stated that the appeal property is locally listed and has provided an extract to show it has been included on the local list due to its aesthetic merits, social and communal value, landmark qualities, intactness and its architectural interest. However, the Council has not presented anything in the evidence before me to suggest whether it is on the local list or not.
10. Even if the host property was on the local list, the proposal would alter the current appearance of the property and would remove distinct features on the roof, such as the chimneys. Therefore, it would be harmful to the property, and thereby the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. Nevertheless, the harm would be less than substantial and in accordance with paragraph 196 of the Framework, that harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimal viable use.
11. The appellant and other interested parties have highlighted the economic and social benefits that the proposal would bring to the hotel and local area, including increased hotel capacity and hours for staff. I note that some of the neighbouring residents to the property have been supportive of the proposal. I also acknowledge the negative impact that the corona virus has had on aspects of the business.
12. Whilst I recognise the economic benefits for staff and the hotel business, which I attribute moderate weight, there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest the proposal is required for the overall viability of the hotel or the other uses within it, such as the public house. As such I am not persuaded that the proposal would bring additional community and social value over what may already exist. Accordingly, these factors would not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area that I have identified above.
13. For the above reasons, the proposed development would cause material harm to the host property, including parts that are of architectural interest and it would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016). These policies and guidance, amongst other things, require

development to respect and respond positively to the local context and character of the area and proactively protect and enhance Barnet's heritage, including locally listed buildings.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*D Peppitt*

INSPECTOR