

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2020

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3251288

144 Mays Lane, Underhill, Barnet EN5 2LS

- 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 John Reid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/0366/HSE, dated 23 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer extension in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/0366/HSE, dated 23 January 2020, 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: 504/1 and 504/2E.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of any development order made under Section 59 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no windows or doors, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be placed at any time in the eastern elevations of the extensions hereby approved, facing No. 140 & 142 Mays Lane.

Procedural matter

2. This application follows on from a previous permission for various works including a rear flat roofed dormer window plus: a first floor rear extension, the conversion of the garage into a habitable room, the insertion of a window to replace the existing garage door, a side door and a rear window. Those other, partly implemented, works are also shown on the submitted plans for the appeal application. The difference is that the appeal application would increase the size of the previously approved rear dormer. That is the element which is

referenced in the description of proposed development and it is the only element to which the Council objects.

Main issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer window structure on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

4. No 144 is an end of terrace 2 storey, hipped roof house set within a residential area with mainly terraced houses of varied architecture including some with dormer windows. The dormer window proposed here would be the same width as the approved dormer but would project further forward to the eaves, making it somewhat deeper and taller than the approved version. The Council's concern is about its this increased height and depth.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guidance* (SPD) lists some points to consider for dormer roof extensions, including that they should normally be subordinate features that do not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof. The proposed dormer would be half the width of the roof and positioned so that it would not break into the line of the hip at the side. Although it would be well over half the depth of the roof, it would step down slightly from the ridge line and would sit reasonably comfortably within the roof of the house and the terrace.
6. The new dormer would be visible, at a distance, from a nearby side street and from neighbouring properties. It would be seen in the context of varied rooflines and other box dormer windows so that it would not be a dominant or intrusive feature in these views.
7. I conclude that the proposed rear dormer structure would not harm the character or the appearance of the building or the local area. It therefore accords with the shared aims of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policies CS1 and CS5, Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document Policy DM01 and the SPD, to secure high quality design based on an understanding of local characteristics and respecting local distinctiveness.
8. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and another requiring matching materials to protect the character and appearance of the area. A final condition restricts the potential future installation of side windows to protect the neighbours' privacy.
9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR