



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2022

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3294261

51 Milton Avenue, Barnet EN5 2EY

- 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 Sabrina Castiglione against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/6492/HSE, dated 8 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as extensions to roof involving raising roof height, 1 no rooflight to the side elevation, and 1 no rooflight to the front elevation, 1 no dormer windows to the side and rear elevations, alterations to the existing extension roof and introduction of a roof lantern.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the existing building and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located along Milton Avenue, a residential street which like surrounding streets, appears to be a formally planned residential estate that dates from the early to mid-twentieth century. Milton Avenue is characteristically low scale with detached and semi-detached bungalows to either side of the carriageway. The dwellings have a relatively functional design where original main components of the dwellings have hipped roof forms with a forward projecting hipped roof component. Dwellings also contain similar design elements such as front bay windows, tall brick plinths to front facades, rendered components and concrete roof tiles.
4. Throughout the estate there is an emphasis on spaciousness and vegetated surrounds with vegetated front gardens and taller trees to the rear; the tops of which can be seen through gaps in between the setbacks of dwellings. These details create positive elements which reflect the qualities of character, appearance and local distinctiveness for this particular location. Whilst there is evidence of extensions and alterations seen throughout the estate, they are generally subservient to the main dwelling and retain the original positive characteristics which contribute to local distinctiveness. Whilst there are some rather large extensions to the roofs of some dwellings, these are limited. As such, I disagree with the appellant's Statement of Case (SoC) that these small

- numbers of overly large extensions to roof forms are part of the positive aspects of the character and local distinctiveness of the area.
5. The appeal site is one of the original characteristic detached bungalows constructed as part of the residential estate in a functional design with main hipped roof and forward projecting hipped roof with brick plinth and rendered façade. The appeal building does contribute towards positive characteristics reinforcing the original design elements of a largely homogenous group of low scale buildings along Milton Avenue.
 6. In undertaking extensions and alterations to existing buildings, the London Borough of Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) Policies CS1 and CS5 seeks to ensure that redevelopment delivers a high quality design by respecting local context and distinctive local character. The London Borough of Barnet Development Management Policies (DMP) Policy DM01 seeks to encourage development that provides positive characteristics such as understanding context, be high quality in design, form, scale, layout and the spaces around them, amongst others. These policies are supported by the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) which offers guidance on specific elements of designing new schemes and alterations, taking into account context and character, amongst others.
 7. When considering roof extensions, the RDG notes that roof extensions can have large impacts upon the character within an area. Whilst the roof is to be raised 1 metre, the proposed roof extension would lift the height of the apex of the roof which would change the proportions of the roof and result in an awkward and elongated appearance that would be disproportionate and affect the architectural integrity of this functional building.
 8. With regards to the dormer windows, as per the RDG, the planning of dormer windows is required in order to ensure appropriate placement, and subservience, particularly noting whether dormer windows are a characteristic of the surrounding locality. The proposal includes 3 dormer windows, where one is placed on the sides and rear roof planes which overcomplicates the design and adds a large amount of visual clutter to the simple and functional roof form. The amount of dormers proposed would clutter the roof forms and elevate the status of the dwelling and could not be considered a subservient element to the proposed roof.
 9. I note commentary in the appellant's SoC with regards to inconsistency with decisions where No.s 47 and 51 Milton Avenue were originally refused by the Council and approved on appeal. The appeal documents do not contain any details as to the considerations in these appeals and whether the considerations were comparable to this appeal proposal. However, on review of the plans submitted of No.47 and No.51 Milton Avenue, and from what I saw on my site visit; the designs are quite different and do not incorporate the amount of dormer windows as proposed under this appeal. That said, I do not consider that these approvals provide adequate justification for the appropriateness of this particular scheme.
 10. Taken as a whole, and in conclusion of this matter, in this particular circumstance, the proposed roof extension and dormers would be incongruous in this location as a result of design, massing and visual bulk, and not reflective of the positive characteristics of the character and appearance of the area. The development would cause an incongruous element within the street scene

which would cause detriment to the functional architectural authenticity of the existing dwelling and of the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the CS Policies CS1 and CS5, and DMP Policy DM01 which are supported by the RDG as described previously.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR