



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3287558

43 Woodside Avenue, North Finchley, London, N12 8AT

- 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 Haseeb Haque against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/2854/HSE, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is new loft conversion with rear and front dormers and veluxes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an extended two storey detached dwelling situated adjacent to a prominent corner location where Woodside Avenue meets Woodside Grange Road.
 4. The appeal property is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of two storey detached dwellings along the same side of the road as No 43 and by a range of two and three storey properties, largely comprising flats, on the opposite side of Woodside Avenue.
 5. Properties are set back from the road behind front garden and parking areas. Together, the presence of front gardens, occasional hedgerows, wide pavements with street trees, the set-back of dwellings and regular low brick front boundaries, all combine to provide for a significant sense of greenery and spaciousness.
 6. Dwellings thus appear within a spacious setting, especially the appeal property, which is located immediately adjacent to an area of public open space. This, along with its location close to the corner of Woodside Avenue and Woodside Grange Road, results in the appeal property appearing prominently in its surroundings.
-

7. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings in the area, including the appeal property, have been altered and/or extended. I also noted that such changes generally appear in keeping with host properties and the character of the area.
8. In the above regard, with the exception of one dwelling immediately alongside a flat-roofed three storey block of flats, none of the detached dwellings nearby to and on the same side as Woodside Avenue as the appeal property have a forward-facing front dormer at second floor level.
9. The proposed development would involve the construction of a large front dormer, at second storey height, with a tall window and a pitched roof.
10. I find that the prominent siting, scale and pitched roof design of the proposed dormer, with its large expanse of glazing, would result in it appearing as a stark and unduly obtrusive feature that would jar with the appeal property's crowned roof. It would also appear as an awkward addition that would fail to complement the appeal property's first floor front gable roof and ground floor front lean-to roofs.
11. The harmful impact of all of the above would be exacerbated as a result of the appeal property's prominent location and spacious setting, whereby the proposal would draw the eye as a highly visible, unduly dominant and incongruous feature.
12. The appellant, in support of the proposal, draws attention to other dormer windows elsewhere. However, the design and circumstances relating to each of these are different. In any case, notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposed development would result in significant harm, leading to the decision below.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); to Policy DM01 of Barnet's Adopted Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012); and to Barnet's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR