



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3292119
27 Brookfield Crescent, London NW7 2DH

- 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 Emma Selmon against the decision of London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 21/4928/HSE, dated 10 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2021.
 - The proposed development is for proposed hip to gable loft conversion with main dormer, façade alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development is the same as that used on the Council's decision notice but the description below reflects that of the application form. Therefore I have used the description used within the Application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi detached suburban house within a crescent of similar properties, each exhibiting typical features inspired by the architectural forms associated with the Arts and Crafts movement. Such details as hipped roofs, steeply pitched extensions and pantile and render materials are all synonymous with this character and add substantially to the overall character and appearance of the area.
5. The existing property maintains much of this continuity of form including its original hipped roof and an attractive asymmetric pitched roof rear extension. Within the local area many houses have sought to change some of these features however through the change of hip roof to gable and the introduction of large box dormer windows to the rear elevations. Indeed the pair of semi detached houses of which the appeal property forms half of has been somewhat unbalanced due to the adjoining house altering their original hip to

that of a gable roof and including such a large dormer. I understand that these changes were made under Permitted Development Rights.

6. The proposal before me seeks to echo the adjoining property through changing the original hip to a gable roof form and through the construction of a similar flat roof box dormer to the rear.
7. I saw on my site visit that the side of the property was partially visible from some locations including from an oblique view along Brookfield Crescent. It also appeared highly prominent when viewed from allotment gardens to the rear of the property. Although the change from hip to gable would therefore affect these views, what would be potentially worse would be for this pair of semi detached houses to continue to be as visually unbalanced as they currently are. I therefore agree with both parties that the change from hip to gable would represent a positive alteration.
8. In terms of the rear dormer however, although the area exhibits several similar such dormers to other properties, I consider that these are generally of an overly large design that contributes to a general erosion of character. Although I note this precedent and previous applications as advanced by the Appellant, I do not have the precise details before me as to the details that lead to many of these similar roof modifications being approved. Nevertheless, I consider that more such dormers would not necessarily be positive and consider that more similar roof extensions and dormers would actually cause more significant harm to the character of the area.
9. Ultimately I consider that there would be ways to construct a rear dormer extension so as to meet the Appellant's needs and meet the Council's Residential Design Guidance. Although I therefore find it acceptable to balance the pair of semi detached houses through the change from hip to gable in this instance, I find that the overall bulk, massing and poor design of the proposed rear dormer would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area that is not outweighed by the potential benefits to the Appellant.
10. As such I consider the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy DPD (2012) and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) as well as the guidance contained within the Barnet Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016). As a result the appeal must fail.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR