



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: 26 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3319497

35 Holders Hill Avenue, Hendon, London NW4 1ES

- 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 C/O Agent - UPP, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/4160/RCU, dated 12 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2023.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "the erection of a ground floor side and rear extension and first floor rear extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof extension including a hip to gable and rear dormer window. Part single storey, part two storey side/rear extension at 35 Holders Hill Avenue, London, NW4 1ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/4160/RCU, dated 12 August 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading has been taken from the planning application form. The Council altered the description of the development. This is the description set out on the appeal form and a more accurate description of the appeal development and I have used it in my decision above.
3. The extensions to the property have been constructed, and therefore the appeal proposal is retrospective. For the avoidance of doubt the outbuilding shown on the drawings does not form part of the appeal scheme and is not part of my considerations here.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house on a street of similar properties. Dwellings are largely designed with hipped roofs with some variety in roof forms where hip to gable extensions have been added. The properties are evenly spaced and feature symmetrical projecting bays, which maintain a rhythm and continuity within the street scene. To the rear, many properties on Holders Hill Avenue have dormer roof extensions and have been extended at ground level. The rear extensions are of varying design and influence the

character and appearance of the area in particular at roof level where rear dormers are prominent features on properties when viewed from Robin Lane, which is at a lower land level.

6. The Council conclude that the rear single and first floor extensions largely accord with a previous planning permission. Further, the hip to gable addition to the roof is considered acceptable. Based on the evidence before me and my site visit, I see no reason to disagree. The focus of the Council's concerns is the rear dormer extension and the overall effect of the development when taken cumulatively.
7. The dormer is set in slightly from the edge of the roof and finished in hanging tiles to match it, both the ground floor and first floor extensions are finished in red brick, consistent with the original house. The restrained palette of external materials unifies the development and reflects the materials in the area. IN this context the dormer window is not an incongruous or dominant feature.
8. The first floor extension is relatively modest in terms of its width and is set in significantly from the shared boundary with the attached property, it also has a hipped roof that limits its bulk. At ground floor level the extension mirrors the extension on the attached property and is stepped in from the boundary. The varied widths and depths of each element of the development act to break up the structure, adding visual interest. Taking into account all of the above, the cumulative impact of the development is not considered to have a harmful impact on the appeal property.
9. Further, the change in land levels restricts views of the ground floor of properties from Robin Lane. Although upper floors and the roof lines are visible the development is not harmfully inconsistent with the prevailing pattern of development and is not incongruous or overly prominent within the street scene.
10. While the development does not accord with elements of the guidance within the Barnet: Residential Design Guidance SPD 2016, for the reasons detailed above, I am satisfied that the development does not result in harm.
11. I conclude that the appeal development does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It accords with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policies CS1 and CS5 of the LB Barnet: Local Plan DPD (2012); Policy DM01 of the LB Barnet: Local Plan DPD (2012). The policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to secure development that is sympathetic to the local character and the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

12. The principal elevation of most of the dwellings on Robin Lane face the rear boundary of the dwellings on Holders Hill Avenue. The length of the rear garden of the appeal property is such that there is a significant separation distance between the development and Robin Lane. As such I am satisfied that the development is not harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of 16 Robin Lane.

Conditions

13. The application is retrospective and therefore conditions relating to the approved plans and matching materials are not necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan and therefore should be allowed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR