



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2020

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3254207

32 Allandale Avenue, Finchley, London, N3 3PJ

- 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 J Berman against the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/1725/HSE, dated 6 April 2020, was refused by the local planning authority on 1 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'loft conversion and remodelling, including 3 front facing dormers and 3 rear facing dormers'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension involving 3no rear and 3no front facing dormer windows at 32 Allandale Avenue, Finchley, London, N3 3PJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1725/HSE.

Procedural matters

2. The application form describes the development proposed as provided in the final bullet header above. However, this was subsequently altered by the Council to a 'Roof extension involving 3no rear and 3no front facing dormer windows.' In making the appeal, this revised description was accepted by the appellant, and I have therefore amended the description of the development accordingly in my decision.
3. The development applied for has been carried out.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling, and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a large traditional detached hipped roof dwelling that is located in a predominantly residential area that is characterised by houses of various sizes and styles. The front façade of the appeal dwelling presents a relatively simple and balanced composition with a centrally positioned ground floor front door and first floor arched window above it. These are flanked by vertically aligning ground and first floor windows to each side.
6. The Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) advises that, amongst other things, dormer roof extensions

should normally be subordinate features that do not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof. In terms of design, this also sets out that dormers should reflect the style and proportions of windows on the existing house and should normally align with the windows below.

7. The Council has not raised any objection to the rear dormer elements of the development and I have no reason to disagree with this. However, it considers that the proposed three front dormer windows would represent an unacceptable proliferation of roof extensions that would dominate the front roof slope of the appeal dwelling.
8. It is uncontested that the appeal dwelling benefits from planning permission (Ref: 20/0047/HSE) for two front dormers of a size, scale, design and position similar to two of those already constructed. As such, the only difference from the previous permission is the introduction of an additional dormer in between the two previously approved and existing front dormers extensions.
9. The additional dormer is centrally positioned to vertically align with the first floor arched window and the ground floor front door below it. It has also been designed to reflect the style and proportions of the two previously approved dormer extensions. Furthermore, all of the proposed front dormers are noticeably set back from the ridge and eaves and set in from the hips of the original dwelling's roof.
10. The appellant's measurements indicate that there would be an approximate 2.2 metre gap retained between the central front dormer and the cheeks of the two other dormers in the front roof plane and I have no reason to question this. As a result, a large expanse of the front roof slope, and space around all of the three modestly sized dormer extensions has been maintained.
11. In light of the above, I consider that the front dormers would not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof, and that they appear balanced, proportionate and subordinate to the original dwelling.
12. During my site visit, I also saw several examples of properties along Allandale Avenue that have been extended and externally altered to include front dormer extensions. Whilst I appreciate that none of these houses contain more than two front dormer extensions, I do not consider that the proposal would appear dominant or unsympathetic in this context.
13. I have been made aware that amended plans were received to reduce the proposed number of dormers to the front from three to two under one of the previous planning permissions on the site. However, this had no bearing on my decision, as I have determined the appeal proposal based on its own merits.
14. I therefore find that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. It therefore does not conflict with Policies CS1, CS5 and CS NPPF of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012), Policy 7.16 of the London Plan (2016) and advice in the SPD (2016). Together these policies and guidance seek to ensure that, amongst other things, new development complements the character and appearance of the area.

15. For the reasons given above, I consider that the appeal should therefore be allowed. No conditions are necessary as the development has already taken place.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR