

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3287310

42 Cranbourne Gardens, Golders Green, London NW11 0HP

- 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 Ashok Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/2300/HSE, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the enlargement of the rear dormer window to the rear elevation of dwelling house.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3287309) on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached property that has an existing rear dormer. The attached neighbour also has a rear dormer, which extends most of the width of the roof slope but is well set up from the eaves line. There is a similar semi-detached pair neighbouring the appeal site, both of which feature large rear dormers; these are set below the ridge height of the properties. Next to the appeal site is a public accessway which allows views of the rear of the property.
6. The proposal would increase the size of the existing dormer, so that it extends to meet the roof of the two-storey side projection. The ridge height of the side projection sits slightly lower than the ridge height of the part of the dwelling where the existing dormer is located. The proposed extension to the existing dormer would sit slightly above the ridge of the side projection. It would

therefore fail to appear subordinate to the property and would harm the appearance of the host dwelling and semi-detached neighbour. This would be visible from the public accessway to the side of the appeal site and would thus harm the appearance of the surrounding area.

7. Dormers in the vicinity of the appeal site predominantly appear subordinate to the main dwellings. The rear dormer on the semi-detached neighbour, 40 Cranbourne Gardens, achieves this through its significant set up from the eaves. The rear dormer at 44 Cranbourne Gardens, although large, is set below the ridge of the main dwelling. Furthermore, No.44 has a similar two-storey side projection as the appeal dwelling, and the height of the dormer drops below the ridge where it connects to the side projection. The large rear dormer at 46 Cranbourne Gardens is also set below the ridge of the main dwelling and reflects the fenestration of the main dwelling to ensure subordination. These examples are thus not comparable to the appeal proposal.
8. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy¹, which requires that development respect local context. It would also not comply with Policy DM01 of the DMP², which looks to ensure development preserves local character and respects the appearance of surrounding streets. The proposal would also go against the aims of the SPD³, which outlines how dormers should not rise above the ridge and should be subordinate features on the roof.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would slightly increase the usable loft space however this would only be by a small amount. This benefit would be limited and would thus not outweigh the harm from the proposal to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR

¹ Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (adopted 2012)

² Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (adopted 2012)

³ Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (adopted 2016)