



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 October 2021

by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/21/3272995

First Floor Flat, 170 Colney Hatch Lane, Colney Hatch N10 1ET

- 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 Ms Susan Werner against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/3908/FUL, dated 25 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension involving dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted drawings show a small discrepancy with respect to the height of the existing side dormer. This seems to be shown to be higher on the side elevation drawing than is evident on the front elevation. It appears to me that the side elevation more accurately plots the existing dormer and I have considered the proposal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Colney Hatch Lane includes buildings that range from semi-detached two storey housing to three storey terraced rows. The area therefore has a pattern of development that encompasses a variety of styles and scales. The appeal site is a semi-detached property that has been subdivided into two flats. Its roof space has been converted with a side box dormer attached to its hipped roof. The rear elevation retains a traditional hipped roof with discrete rooflights and two single storey extensions that include a first-floor terrace. The building is elevated from the highway with a narrow side passage. Consequently, the existing dormer is a discrete addition enabling the building to make a positive contribution to the streetscene.
5. The proposed rear dormer would be located behind the existing side dormer. It would therefore have a limited impact on views of the street. The Council's Residential Design Guidance (2016) seeks dormers to not wrap around a hipped roof and to not occupy more than half the width of the roof space. The proposed dormer, in combination with the existing side dormer, would

- encompass a large area of the original roof. It would also include an oversized window and a substantial area of cladding that would collectively create a bulky and solid form.
6. Consequently, the scale of the proposal would be disproportionate to the existing roof form extending to the full width of the building and adding a sizeable feature to the rear elevation. Furthermore, the proposed windows would not align, or be in proportion, with those at first floor. The proposed dormer would not therefore complement the proportions or window configuration of the host building and would be a discordant addition.
 7. Therefore, whilst the proposal would have a limited effect on the streetscene, its impact on the character and appearance of the existing building would be substantially adverse. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to satisfy policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy (2012), policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan - Development management Policies DPD (2012) and the Council's Residential Design Guidance (2016). These policies seek development to be a high quality design and for dormer windows to be subordinate additions to a roof.
 8. The dormer would be similar in scale to several local examples. However, their planning context and whether these were subject to planning consideration is not before me. I am therefore unconvinced that the local examples illustrate a clear planning precedent to convey support for the proposal. The personal needs of the appellant and the improved thermal performance of the roof raise matters of moderate weight in favour of the proposal. However, these merits would not outweigh the harm identified to the appearance of the building.
 9. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR