
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3315305

37 Haslemere Avenue, Hendon, Barnet, London, NW4 2PU

- 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 Levy against the decision of Barnet London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/3734/HSE, dated 19 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable and extension to rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The dwelling sits in a prominent location at the junction of Haslemere Avenue and Shirehall Lane. The existing side and rear elevations are clearly evident. The proposal would result in the loss of the existing hipped roof to the Shirehall Lane side and the replacement of the existing relatively modest rear facing dormer with a much larger structure. The existing side elevation includes two matching gables with distinctive central chimney features. These reflect, to some extent, the similar details of the two properties to the north. The proposal would retain chimneys in this location, set against the proposed full depth gable that would replace both the hipped roof and the side facing gables.
 4. The proposed rear dormer would be a substantial box style structure that would dominate the revised rear roof form. It would not reflect the character or style of the house or the detailing below it. This structure would be clearly evident, indeed prominent, in views from Shirehall Lane. This element of the proposal, in particular, would detract from the appearance of this property and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 5. As the house sits close to the side boundary, the side elevation has a significant impact on the street scene. The existing side elevation provides articulation and some quality in the design of the twin gables and chimneys. The proposal would be more dominant, of a greater scale and the design
-

interest of the side elevation would be lost. A hip to gable alteration in this location would have only a limited wider impact, but when taken together with the proposed dormer, it would be harmful.

6. Although the property has been much altered, this proposal would erode the quality of the existing property design. It would detract from the appearance of the street scene and would represent poor design in this particular context. It would conflict with the design aspirations of Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 as it would not respect the local context and distinctive local character and would not be of high quality design. I also find conflict with Policy DM01 (a. & b.) of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012 for the same reasons. As these policies accord with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework, I afford them considerable weight.
7. The Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 provides detailed advice suggesting that dormer roof extensions should normally be subordinate features on the roof and should not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof slope. It also suggests that to retain the balance of the house, the dormer roof extension should not normally be wider than the window below it and the dormer cheeks should be kept as narrow as possible. The proposal conflicts with this guidance.
8. The neighbouring property does have a large rear facing box style dormer similar to that proposed. Being further from the corner, although it is discernible from Shirehall Lane, it is much less prominent compared to the position of this proposal. Its presence does not suggest that this development should be accepted. Images have also been provided of other dormers in the area which I was able to view. I am not aware of the history of these additions but in any event, they do not represent a good reason for allowing a new substantial dormer in such a prominent position.
9. It is suggested that a large dormer could be erected utilising permitted development rights subject to a number of changes to the property. Even if I were to consider such works likely, the potential for a different large dormer, set within the original roof slope, does not offer significant support for this development.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would detract from the appearance of the dwelling and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would conflict with the development plan. Although it would provide enhanced accommodation and increased economic activity, I am not satisfied that there are any matters sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR