



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3249232

17 Beechwood Avenue, Finchley, London N3 3AU

- 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 & Mrs Hardeep & Anita Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
- The application Ref 20/0062/HSE, dated 7 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2020.
- The proposed development is front dormer window.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for front dormer window at 17 Beechwood Avenue, Finchley, London, N3 3AU, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0062/HSE, dated 7 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location Plan AD/2020/054/01, Existing and Proposed Site Plan AD/2020/054/02, Existing Floor Plans AD/2020/054/04, Proposed Floor Plans AD/2020/054/04, Existing and Proposed Front Elevation AD/2020/054/05 Rev A and Existing and Proposed Rear and Side Elevations AD/2020/054/06/Rev A.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. In the drawings submitted during the course of the application, the position of the proposed front dormer as shown on the proposed floor plans was inconsistent with how it was shown on the proposed elevations. During the course of this appeal, the appellant has provided accurate and consistent drawings, so that now the proposed elevations correspond accurately to the floor plans. While neighbouring occupants have not had the chance to provide comments on these amended drawings, I consider that they would not be
-

prejudiced by my acceptance of them as they regularise rather than alter the proposal. I have therefore accepted these revised plans and have based my determination on them.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling on the northern side of Beechwood Avenue. Beechwood Avenue is characterised by large detached dwellinghouses, as well as some semi-detached pairs. Properties along Beechwood Avenue are varied in their form, size and materiality. To the west of the appeal site, Nos 11 and 15 feature front dormer windows, while several properties along the street feature side dormer windows. To the east of the appeal site, No 27 is characterised by a prominent, Dutch-style front gable projection and portico, and properties further to the east have Arts-and-Crafts style architectural detailing.
6. As the street has such a diverse and heterogenous character, the proposed front dormer would not appear particularly incongruous within this context, especially as there are two front dormer windows within close proximity to the west. Furthermore, as the proposed dormer would be centrally positioned within the front roofslope between the two front hipped roof projections, set down from the top of the roof, and have the same materiality as the existing building, it would not appear as an overly prominent or unsympathetic addition to the host building. Due to the appropriate scale, siting and design of the proposed dormer, the appeal property would have a balanced appearance that would relate positively to the character of the street and the broader area.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 and Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012 which, amongst other things, state that development should provide a high quality design response to the existing street, be of the highest quality in terms of architecture and urban design, and respect local context and character.
8. The proposal would also comply with the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016, which states that development should respect and enhance the positive features of Barnet's character and local distinctiveness.

Conditions

9. The conditions imposed are those suggested by the Council, with due regard given to the advice on imposing conditions in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
10. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. In the interests of character and appearance, I have

also required that the materials to be used shall match those of the existing building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR