



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2023

by R Lawrence MRTPI, BSc (hons), PGDip (TP)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3317243

27 St. Andrews Road, LONDON NW11 0PH

- 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 Dr Taimur Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/6107/HSE, dated 24 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as "Hip to gable roof extension to enable a loft conversion, comprising a rear box dormer. A forward facing dormer is also included to enable ease and practicality of access to the loft via staircase over the existing".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note that the proposed development includes 2 roof lights on the front roof slope, whilst not included within the description of the development, these are clearly shown on the submitted plans and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two storey property. The property has a high level of consistency with the prevailing character of the area which is primarily made up of semi-detached properties with steeply pitched roofs and two storey front projections. The degree of uniformity within the roofscape, positively contributes to the character of the area.
5. The proposed box dormer on the front roof projection, described as a side dormer on the decision notice, would appear at odds with the steeply pitched roofs which characterise both the appeal property and the surrounding area. The box dormer would be modest in scale, however, given its forward position, it would be clearly visible within the street scene.
6. There are some other examples of box dormers within the street scene. The appeal property together with the adjoining semi, contain small front box dormers set low down in the roof slope, positioned centrally between the two projecting front dormers. These are common features within the street scene and are of a traditional design. These are set below the eaves line of the two

storey front projections serving the first floor. The proposed box dormer would have a very different impact due to its higher position and would detract from the prominence of traditional pitched roof forms within the street.

7. There are a small number of examples of other box dormers, set higher within the roof slope, like that proposed. It is unclear whether or not these benefit from planning permission, although they nonetheless have an influence on the character of the area. Given these examples are very small in number, these do not detract from the prominence of steeply pitched front roofs within the street scene. Consequently, they do not alter my findings, in respect of the proposed box dormer which, due to its prominent position, would have a negative effect upon the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
8. The proposal also includes various other elements, including a hip to gable roof extension, a loft conversion and two roof lights. I note that the rear box dormer benefits from a permitted development fall back, and on this basis the Council does not raise any objection to this element. Similarly, the Council does not raise any objection to the remaining elements of the scheme. These elements, in general terms, would preserve the traditional pitched roof of the property as viewed from the site frontage. Therefore, I find no reason to disagree with the Council's findings in this respect. This does not alter my findings in terms of the proposed box dormer on the front roof slope and the main issue.
9. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DM01 of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document 2012 (LP), which, amongst other matters, seeks to preserve or enhance the local character. These same principles are reflected in Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the London Borough of Barnet Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance October 2016 both of which I find the scheme would also conflict with.

Other Matters

10. I note the suggestion that the dormer is necessary to provide stair access into the proposed loft conversion, and that other options would not be economical. Even if I were to accept this position, this would not alter my findings in terms of compliance with the development plan.
11. The Council's refusal reason also refers to Policy DM02 of the LP. This seeks to require compliance with a range of other national and London wide standards and my attention has not been drawn to any wording in it that relates to the main issue. It has therefore not been determinative to the appeal.

Conclusion

12. The appeal scheme would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other matters which would indicate that planning permission should be granted. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Lawrence

INSPECTOR

