
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/23/3317852

Flat 3, 254-256 Watford Way, Hendon, London NW4 4UJ

- 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 Shiraz Dhanji against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/5444/FUL, dated 7 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a rear roof extension to create an additional storey at second floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to the upper part of this 2 storey building which also has accommodation at roof level at the appeal site. The property is part of a much larger, curved terrace of commercial uses at ground floor and residential uses above. It is located adjacent to the junction of Watford Way (A41) and Greyhound Hill.
4. The properties within the terrace have one, continuous roof over the whole terrace, although different ownerships have resulted in some different tiles being present. At the rear, the appeal property currently has 2 modestly sized dormer windows that serve the second floor flat. I saw only one other instance of the rear roof of the terrace being broken by a single modest dormer.
5. The proposal would extend the second floor with a flat-roofed extension from the roof and out over the existing first floor. Generally, the properties here have accommodation at the ground and first floors. Numerous extensions exist at the ground floor, with a variety of sizes and designs, often with plant and extraction equipment visible. A number of 2 storey projecting sections of the buildings are also present, spaced regularly at the rear of the terrace and these could be original to the terrace.

6. The proposal would remove the 2 existing dormers and extend rearwards by around 7.2m and with a width of around 6m and 3m in height. This would represent a significant addition at the highest level of the building where no other such extensions exist. Its size and stark, block-like appearance would mean that the proposal would fail to harmonise with the existing building and it would appear significantly out of place. I accept that the environment at the rear of the terrace is visually busy with numerous additions and extensions which often appear ad hoc in nature. However, the roof-line which is largely unbroken is a consistent feature at the upper level and is visible from some points in the neighbouring residential road. Where the roof is broken, it is by modest dormers which retain much of the original roof around them and so appear as sympathetic additions. The appeal proposal would have a completely different effect.
7. Although not referred to by the appellant, the Council makes reference to a previous, successful appeal at the property (Council's Ref: 18/6307/FUL). Although no details have been included, the description refers to extending the 2 existing dormers sideways so that they join; this is quite different to the current appeal scheme. Additionally, the Council points out that the permission arising from the appeal was dated 17 April 2019 and has now expired.
8. In conclusion, the proposal would have a significant and negative effect on the character and appearance of the area. It gives rise to conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies). Having taken account of all other matters, I find that this conflict is not outweighed by any other matters. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR