

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 June 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3271166

25 Princes Park Avenue, London, NW11 0JR

- 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 AY Leichtag against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/5210/HSE, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is roof extension involving rear and side dormer windows, 2no front facing rooflights.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that any references made to the revised Framework within this decision would not be unreasonable to the parties.
4. The description of development on the application form is "erection of crown roof with side and rear dormers to facilitate a loft conversion" whereas the description in the banner header above is as used on the decision notice and appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The area around the site is characterised by large detached and semidetached, individually designed dwellings. Whilst there are a mix of roof types in the area, and some dwellings have been extended, the area is characterised by spaces between the buildings which is particularly noticeable within the roofscape. 25 Princes Park Avenue itself is a previously extended detached dwelling set back from the highway with a driveway to the frontage and is located prominently at the junction with Leaside Crescent which allows longer range views of the property.
7. The appeal proposal would increase the bulk and massing of the roof, including increasing the steepness of the pitches roof to all elevations. The resultant roof, including the mansard element and the dormer extensions would be a bulky and dominant feature which would not reflect the design of the host property. It would be a prominent feature in the streetscene and would harmfully erode the spaciousness of the locality.
8. I acknowledge that there are several examples of extended roofs in the area that my attention has been drawn to. I am unconvinced that these developments are directly comparable to the proposal before me given their immediate context, and the different style of development involved in each case. In addition, I am not aware of the circumstances that led to their approval including the relevant development plan policies in place at the time. I do not have the full details of the proposal at 102 Princes Park Avenue before me and cannot therefore be certain that the proposal is directly comparable. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on the site-specific circumstances of the case.
9. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposed roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and that of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) or the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD9 (2016) which together seek to ensure that extensions respect the character and appearance of the original dwelling as well as its local setting.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR