



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3307631

23 Oakmead Gardens, Edgware, HA8 9RW

- 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 Mrs Norah Penawou against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/0979/HSE, dated 23 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a roof extension involving gambrel roof addition and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's Decision Notice as this more accurately describes the proposed development. I note the Council's description of development is also noted on the appellant's appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon the existing building and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at the corner of Oakmead Gardens and the A41 Edgware Way, although a barrier prevents vehicular access from Oakmead Gardens onto the A41. The local area forms a number of streets that contains formally laid out speculative housing which appears to date from the early to mid-twentieth century. The locality contains predominantly detached and semi-detached dwellings which have a symmetry in their placement with a consistent building line and setback with front gardens and low boundary walls. There are also visual gaps in between properties predominantly at first floor level above garages where glimpses to the tops of trees in rear gardens are experienced and is a positive characteristic of the area alongside trees to front gardens. I disagree with the appellant's Statement of Case (SoC) that there is a mixed character within this immediate context with the dominant typology of roof forms being hipped with a similar eave height, design, proportion and simple and functional form. On my site visit I noticed that the main dwellings had very similar functional design, proportions and size characteristics with brown concrete roof tiles, the use of brick and feature areas of render, large forward projecting canted bay windows, hipped roof forms, and coaxial chimney stacks

- which are a dominant feature to the locality and design of the dwellings, amongst others.
5. The appeal site is a relatively recent infill development which consists of a detached dwelling that has an inverted L-Shaped floor plan with a main gable roof form running from the front to the rear of the property, with a hipped roof projecting from the main gable running to the north of the dwelling. Whilst the appeal site is seen as a new build within this street scene, it does carry some of the positive characteristics in design such as maintaining a similar scale, functional design, proportion and hipped roof form as found within the locality. These positive elements reinforce the local character, appearance and distinctiveness of the area. Whilst there are extensions and alterations to surrounding properties, they are generally subservient and maintain the dominant characteristics in terms of their design and appearance.
 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, such as local character, pattern of development, building line and setbacks, scale, massing and height, materials, colour and architectural detailing, amongst others. Policy D3 of the London Plan is also relevant in that this policy seeks that new development take a design orientated approach in terms of context, character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 7. The proposal would change the hipped roof form to a gambrel roof which would be an uncharacteristic type of roof form within this locality and has an overcomplicated appearance when seen against the more functional design of the surrounding dwellings. It is noted in the RDG that extensions should reflect the roof form of the host dwelling, and the local context which this would not. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's comments with regards to the uniqueness of the site, the proposed roof form would further diverge from the design features of the existing dwelling which currently attempt to respond to its context. The gambrel roof extension would have an overcomplicated form and be unlike anything in the immediate context and would not reflect the positive qualities of local character and distinctiveness.
 8. I also note comments in the appellant's SoC regarding the needs of the occupiers with a growing family. Whilst I am empathetic to this reasoning, this would not overcome the poor relationship to the context of the area, with there being potentially other ways to accommodate a growing family whilst being more in accordance with the development plan policies.
 9. In conclusion of this matter, the proposed extension would result in the loss of positive characteristics, be overcomplicated and would be clearly disproportionate and the additional visual bulk and massing would be unlike other buildings constructed within the immediate vicinity. Consequently, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing

building, and the local distinctiveness of the locality on this prominent corner location and be contrary to CS Policies CS1, CS5, and DMP Policy DM01, which is supported by the RDG as described previously. Additionally, the scheme would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan, all of which were described previously.

Conclusion

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

J Somers
INSPECTOR