



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2023

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3314232

25 Princes Park Avenue Golders Green London NW11 0JR

- 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 A Leichtag against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/4136/HSE, dated 11 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension. Roof extension involving side and rear dormer windows and front and side facing rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension and a roof extension involving side and rear dormer windows and front and side facing rooflights at 25 Princes Park Avenue Golders Green London NW11 0JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/4136/HSE, dated 11 August 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2210. SP Proposed Site Plan, 2210.LP Proposed Location Plan, 2210.P1 Proposed First Floor Plan, 2210.P2 Proposed Loft Plan, 2210.P3 Proposed Roof Plan, 2210.P4 Proposed Elevations, 2210.P5 Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is based on that used in the decision notice. I note too that this description was used by the appellant within the appeal documentation. For clarity I have used that in preference to the description on the original application form as it is more precise.

3. The parties have drawn my attention to a previous appeal decision¹ in relation to the host dwelling. Although I do not have full details of this decision, including the plans, I have had regard to it insofar as it appears relevant to the proposal before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached property located on a large plot within a residential area characterised by large detached and semi detached properties of different designs and styles. The variety in the properties, non uniformity and different roof forms are part of the current character of the residential area. The appeal property itself has been previously extended and these extensions are well assimilated and sympathetic to the design of the original dwelling.
6. The appeal scheme before me is a revised scheme following a previous appeal decision on an earlier application. The revised scheme is similar in design to the previous proposal in the raising of the roof to incorporate a mansard roof and side dormers. It would now extend over a proposed first floor rear extension increasing the width of the extension. However it has been reduced in height and the steepness of the roof slopes has also been reduced. Parts of the pitched roof elements of the original roof would be retained and although higher than existing, the subordinate ridge would maintain a lower roofline. As such although the roof form of the appeal property would change, I do not consider the alteration would be uncharacteristic of the area and although larger than existing it would not necessarily harm the integrity of the appeal property or the area. Nor would the alterations to the rear be out of keeping with the appeal property given its existing scale and form.
7. The Council acknowledge that the proposed dormers in themselves would comply with the guidelines set out in the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD). Their concern relates to the combination of the dormers within the proposed roof alterations. However their positioning, set down from the ridge of the main dwelling and set in from the side roof slopes with sufficient set back from the front elevation would reduce their visual impact. They would not appear disproportionate relative to the appearance of the roof in the longer views obtained of the appeal property from Leaside Crescent. Nor would their overall size be inconsistent with other dormers within the vicinity that I was able to observe on my site visit. The scale, form and design of the resultant roof would not therefore be unduly bulky and prominent within the streetscene nor harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
8. I appreciate the Council's concern that the revised scheme would result in a "top heavy" roof. The proposal would increase the upper part of the building but the resultant scale would not be significantly different to others in the area as to be unduly prominent or obtrusive in the street scene. Although the visual gap in the roofscape between the appeal property and its neighbouring

¹ Ref.No. APP/N5090/D/21/3271166

properties would be partially filled, the nature of the roof alterations, and the positioning and design of the dormers would not be incongruous. Further, the design as a whole would obviate the problems identified by the previous Inspector arising from the bulk and mass of the earlier proposal. The remaining alterations would be to the rear of the property and would not be visible from the street.

9. I note that the Council has not raised any concerns with regard to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and I would agree with this assessment. Whilst the Council refer in the officer report to the potential for obscure glazing to the window in the side dormer facing No 27 Princes Park Avenue, I note that the suggested conditions do not include such a requirement. Given the siting and positioning of the side dormer within the roof slope and the intended use as a shower room, I do not consider such that a condition is either necessary or reasonable.
10. Accordingly for the reasons above, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Therefore it would comply with Policy CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012). Together these policies require a high standard of design which respects the local context. It would also be in accordance with the principles contained in the SPD which provides for extensions to be subordinate and to respect the original building.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard commencement condition I have also imposed a plans condition to ensure certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is also necessary in the interests of the amenity of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, I hereby allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR