

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/21/3287309

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 21/2298/HSE, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the roof and replacement of rooflight window by a larger rooflight window to the front 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/21/3287310) on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.
4. The Council have confirmed that the replacement of the rooflight with a larger rooflight is considered to be compliant with permitted development rights and that they consider the larger rooflight to be acceptable. Therefore, the focus of this appeal will be on the other alterations to the roof.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the alterations to the roof on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site forms part of a semi-detached pair. Although there are differences between the properties, such as colour, rooflights and the existing extension on the appeal site, there are also features that bring the pair together, including the roof form. The surrounding area has a range of roof forms, however there is only one other property that features a similar roof alteration to that proposed.

7. The proposal would alter the roof by introducing an angled roof slope at a corner where the front projection and set back part of the dwelling meet. The introduction of this angled roof slope, despite the fact it would be a similar appearance in terms of materials and regardless of whether it is considered a large front extension, would appear at odds with the existing roof form. It would therefore harm the character of the host dwelling. It would also be visible when passing the property and, although hidden from views in one direction, would harm the street scene.
8. There are differences between the appeal property and the semi-detached neighbour, such as the existing two-storey side extension. However, the extension maintains a similar roof form to the rest of the building and is therefore less detrimental to the appearance of the pair than the proposal. Furthermore, the existing rooflights do not interrupt the roof scape to the same extent as the proposed angled roof form would. Therefore, the proposed alterations to the roof would disrupt the remaining symmetry seen between the semi-detached pair.
9. The variation of roof forms in the surrounding area and differences between other semi-detached pairs would not minimise the harm that would arise to this semi-detached pair. Whilst there is a similar roof alteration on the property at 46 Cranbourne Gardens, angled roof alterations like this and the one proposed do not form the predominant character of the area. Even if the proposed roof alteration would have less impact than that seen at No.46, it would still appear out of character with the host dwelling, semi-detached neighbour, and surrounding roof forms.
10. Overall, the proposed alterations to the roof would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore not accord with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy¹ which together look to ensure development respects local context. It would also not comply with Policy DM01 of the DMP² which seeks to ensure that development respects the appearance of surrounding buildings and streets. Likewise, it would not conform with Policy D3 of the London Plan (adopted 2021), which requires development proposals to respond to local distinctiveness through their scale, appearance, and shape.
11. It would also go against the aims of the SPD³, which suggests that extensions should reflect the design of the original building, whilst having regard to the character of the area.

Other Matters

12. The existing accessibility issues and safety concerns with regards to headroom have been taken into consideration. There are, however, likely to be other ways in which these issues could be solved that would not be as detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. These benefits are thus given limited weight and do not outweigh the harm.

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)

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. 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

14. 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