



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2023

by C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/22/3313551

19A Glendor Gardens, London, NW7 3JY

- 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 Regev Farkask against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/4086/FUL, dated 8 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2022.
 - The development was originally described as 'proposed hip to gable with rear dormer.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. The Council altered the description of the development to 'roof extension involving hip to gable, rear dormer and 1no front facing rooflight.' This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal development and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. On carrying out a site visit I noted that the appeal has been submitted retrospectively as the development appears to have been completed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of 19A Glendor Gardens and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. There is some variety in the style and design of roofs along Glendor Gardens and there are a number of properties in the locality which have roof extensions and alterations. However, as a pair of semi-detached houses, No 17 and 19A had retained the original hipped roof form and had a clear sense of balance and symmetry. The creation of a gable ended roof at the appeal property unbalances the appearance of the pair of houses and removes the sense of symmetry.
6. Whilst the rear dormer is set in from the eaves it extends from the ridge and occupies the majority of the rear roof slope. As such it is considered that the dormer is an unduly dominant and incongruous feature. Although the dormer is not visible from the street, it is clearly visible from a number of neighbouring properties and their gardens.

7. I appreciate that there are a number of examples of both hip to gable and dormer roof extensions on Glendor Gardens. However, I am not aware of the particular circumstances in these cases. In any event I must consider the appeal on its own merits. The existence of other roof extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified.
8. I conclude that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of 19A Glendor Gardens and the surrounding area. Therefore, it conflicts with Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2012), policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (adopted 2012) and the Residential Design Guidance SPD (adopted 2016) (SPD). These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in seeking to ensure that new development respects the character and appearance of the local area. The SPD provides detailed guidance on extensions to dwellings and stipulates that hip to gable extensions should not unbalance a pair of semi-detached properties.

Other Matters

9. I understand that permitted development rights vary between building types. Consequently, I find the permitted development rights of owners in relation to other properties to have limited weight in the determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR