



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2023

by J N Seymour BA (hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3315445

99 Bow Lane, London, N12 0JL

- 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 Covaci against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 22/4750/HSE, dated 23 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2022.
 - The development is described as 'Two storey side extension and hip to gable roof extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and hip to gable extension at 99 Bow Lane, London, N12 0JL, subject to the following conditions, as suggested by the Council:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: PRO 13, EX06, EX04, EX05, PRO 12, PRO 10, PRO 11, PRO 09, PRO 14 and the Design and Access Statement dated September 2022.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the building shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description taken from the application form reads: "*Amendment to Planning Permission 20/1224/HSE to provide a two storey side extension. 2no side facing and 1no front facing conservation rooflights*". However, I have used the description of development displayed on the Council's decision notice because it is more succinct and the one on the application form incorrectly describes the development as an amendment to the previous planning permission (ref: 20/1224/HSE). The fact the appeal is allowed results in another planning permission that is separate from 20/1224/HSE.
3. It is also noteworthy to highlight that a separate appeal (ref: 3315446) has been determined at the neighbouring property 101a Bow Lane, London, N12 0JL for a similar development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is number 99 Bow Lane, a dwelling that forms part of a terrace of three dwellings since the attached neighbouring property at number 101 was recently subdivided into two dwellings, now numbered 101a and 101b. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a similar two-storey side extension to one already permitted by the Council (ref: 20/1224/HSE) with the addition of a hip-to-gable roof extension on the roof structure of the main dwelling and for the roof of the extension. The Council have made it clear in their assessment that they are satisfied with the two-storey extension element of the appeal proposal as a similar structure formed a part of the previous planning permission. I have no reason to disagree with this assessment, however, concerns have been raised in respect of the hip to gable extension.
6. It is acknowledged that the building currently has a hipped roof and this particular element would be altered by the appeal proposal. However, the hipped roof at number 99 was significantly altered by the now-removed box dormer and a half-hipped structure accommodating the staircase to the roof terrace, both of which already unbalanced the roof structure when the building is viewed in its entirety before the construction of the new extension began. Together with the previously approved two-storey side extension, I find that the proposed hip-to-gable extensions do not materially exacerbate any unbalancing effect as previous alterations already created a loss of symmetry. Avoiding an unbalancing effect is one of four criteria set out in the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (SPD) when assessing hip-to-gable extensions, but for the reasons given above, there is no conflict with this part of the SPD.
7. The Council have confirmed the appeal proposal would not reduce the degree of visual separation between houses or form an overbearing wall facing a street, the second and third criteria in the SPD for hip-to gable extensions. I agree with the Council's assessment of the appeal proposal against these criteria. The fourth and final criterion is that hip-to-gable extensions should not appear out of character within the streetscape. The proposed hip-to-gable extension appears no more out of character compared to the previous roof configuration and whilst many of the dwellings on Bow Lane have hipped roofs, many also have gabled roofs and there is no prevailing roof design in the streetscape. Consequently, I have found no conflict with the relevant guidance within the SPD.
8. The hip-to-gable extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the building with the roof sloping back, away from the street. This helps to minimise any perceived additional bulk and massing as the original hipped roof line and central two-storey bay windows remain prominent features allowing the original sections of the building to remain distinct from the more recent side and rear extensions. The appeal proposal would also involve the use of matching materials which would help the development to integrate with the host building.

9. For these reasons, I do not find that the size, scale and design of the extensions are excessively bulky or dominant. Instead, they consolidate the previously approved extensions creating a more coherent appearance to the dwelling as a whole, which helps to preserve the local character whilst respecting the appearance, mass and height of the host building, as advocated in Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies 2012 (DPD). Policy CS5 of Barnet's Core Strategy relates to creating buildings of high-quality design and I have explained above that the appeal proposal has been appropriately designed, therefore also demonstrating compliance with this policy.
10. I shall attach conditions in respect of standard time, carrying out the development in accordance with the approved plans and using matching materials, as suggested by the Council. These are necessary in the interest of providing certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons contained in this letter, I conclude that the appeal is allowed, subject to the mandatory conditions set out above ensuring the development is carried out within the statutory time period and in accordance with the approved plans.

J N Seymour

INSPECTOR