



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: 22 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3315446

101a 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: 22/4751/HSE, dated 23 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2022.
 - The development is described as 'Proposed Hip to Gable Conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed hip to gable conversion at 101a 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 Matter

2. A separate appeal (ref: 3315445) has been determined at the neighbouring property 99 Bow Lane, London, N12 0JL for a similar development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is number 101a Bow Lane, a dwelling that forms part of a terrace of three dwellings, with 101b the centre property adjacent to the appeal site and number 99 on the opposite end of the terrace. The appeal proposal would involve altering the existing hipped roof to create a gabled roof structure.

5. The Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (SPD) does not preclude hip-to-gable extensions, instead it sets out four criteria that should be considered. The first criterion is that a terrace or semi-detached property should not be unbalanced by such development. In this case, the terrace of three dwellings is not symmetrical as number 99 has been previously extended to the side and rear and at the time of my site visit further extensions to the side were under construction. This means the proposed hip-to-gable extension at number 101a does not cause any further excessive unbalancing of the building as a whole.
6. The second criterion states gable should not reduce the degree of visual separation between houses. There is a very narrow space between numbers 101a and 103 but the appeal proposal does not materially reduce this space as the hip-to-gable extension would be set behind the existing brick parapet on the outer wall of the dwelling that sits above the eaves of the property. It is this configuration that ensures the third criterion which seeks to avoid overbearing is also met.
7. 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 would appear similar to the other gabled roofs in Bow Lane, a street that I have observed is not dominated by a single roof design in the streetscape. Consequently, I have found no conflict with the relevant guidance within the SPD.
8. When viewed from the streetscape on Bow Lane, the appeal proposal would not appear excessively bulky as it would extend no higher than the height of the existing ridge line and, as mentioned previously, it would not extend beyond the outer wall of the property. Furthermore, matching facing materials would be used to ensure the extension will integrate with the existing roof structure effectively.
9. Based on my assessment, I do not agree with the Council that the extension would engulf the original property. The extension is modest in size, scale and design which helps to preserve the local character whilst respecting the appearance, mass, and height of the existing terrace, 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 conditions set out above, 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