



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3249677

67 Brackenbury Road, East Finchley, London N2 0SS

- 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 Oksuzoglu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/5782/HSE, dated 26 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'erection of existing loft conversion (second floor) to on to rear first floor extension length of 3m and 3m width'.
-

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 Issues

3. These are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and local area, and on the living conditions of occupiers of No.65 Brackenbury Road and Longfield Court with regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises an end-of-terrace, two-storey dwelling. The rear elevation includes existing ground and first floor extensions as well as a dormer extension to the roof. The proposal seeks to extend a section of the dormer to incorporate a flat roof and project over the first-floor extension.
5. The Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) advises that dormers should be subordinate features on the roof and should not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof slope.
6. The proposal to extend the dormer would add significant mass to the rear elevation of the property. The increase in height would appear bulky to one side which would be compounded by the flat roof, while leaving little of the original rear elevation visible. I note the contention the extension does not add

to the footprint of the property. Be that as it may, the significant addition of built form at roof level would occupy more than half the depth of the roof slope, which would be at odds with the advice contained within the SPD. In combination with the existing first floor extension, the proposal would not be subordinate to the host building.

7. I acknowledge the appeal site is not within a Conservation Area or the setting of a Listed Building. Regardless, due to its scale and positioning it would be highly prominent from the public realm, particularly to the rear. Moreover, it would also be visible from Brackenbury Road through the gap between the appeal property and Longfield Court. Therefore, this proposal would read as an overly dominant addition to the host dwelling and an incongruous addition in the area.
8. I observed rear dormer extensions to be commonplace in the area, although generally speaking these are smaller in scale and subordinate to their host buildings. While some may be larger there are no details of their age, whether they have planning permission or the circumstances that led to their approval before me. Regardless, these would not necessarily be good examples of design to follow. While I appreciate this proposed arrangement would create additional living space for the appellant's family, this would be of private benefit and not outweigh the harm I have identified in this regard.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012) (DMP), Policies CSNPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (CS) and the SPD. Collectively, these seek to ensure proposals, among other aims, preserve or enhance local character and respect the scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets.

Living Conditions

10. While the proposal may be of a limited volumetric increase over the existing dormer and not rise above the host roof ridge, it would introduce an overbearing and visually dominant feature in views from the rear windows and outdoor amenity spaces of No.65 and Longfield Court. This would reduce outlook and create a feeling of enclosure given the projection of the extension. The dominating presence of the proposal would therefore detract from the quality of the living environment in and around both No.65 and Longfield Court.
11. I accept rear windows already exist at roof level of the appeal property. However, to my mind the issue is not one of loss of privacy due to overlooking either No.65 or Longfield Court. As such this does not alter my assessment.
12. To conclude on this second main issue, the proposal would harm living conditions of occupiers of No.65 Brackenbury Road and Longfield Court with regards to visual impact. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM01 of the DMP and the SPD, which state development proposals should be designed to allow for adequate outlook, among other considerations, for adjoining occupiers.

Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR