



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3326078

47 Windsor Road, Barnet EN5 2PS

- 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 Simon Brown against the decision of Barnet London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1128/FUL, dated 15 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion to first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a very large box style dormer that would entirely dominate and change the form of the existing rear roof form. It is unclear from the plans how this would combine with the rear outrigger as the roof appears to cut across the rear facing windows and requires that the roof attaches to the rear face of the dormer. The dormer element of the proposal represents particularly poor design and would be at odds with the general form of the flats and houses in this street. The hip to gable extension would also depart from the prevailing character of properties in this area which have relatively uniform and distinctive hipped roofs. This adds to my main concern with regard to the poor design of the rear dormer.
 4. Given the above, the proposal would be contrary to the aspirations of achieving the highest standards of design and respecting local context as set out in policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan - Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012); policy DM01(a&b) of Barnet's Local Plan - Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012); and policy D3 of the London Plan (2021).
 5. There would be conflict with the principles set out within the council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance 2016 as it would not complement or improve the character of the area through its
-

- appearance or architectural detailing. The proposal also conflicts with the specific guidance that dormers should normally be subordinate features on the roof and should not occupy more than half the width or half the depth of the roof slope; and the proposal fails to take into consideration whether or not hip to gable extensions are a characteristic feature of the street and wider area.
6. The proposal would enhance the living conditions of the occupants and result in economic benefits from its construction. Whilst these support the economic and social objectives of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2023*, these matters do not outweigh the harm to its environmental objectives. The proposal cannot be considered as sustainable development as it represents poor design and the *Framework* is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.
 7. The appellant makes reference to two similar developments at the other end of the street, at 2 and 6 Windsor Road. The works at number 2 were the subject of a lawful development certificate which confirmed that the proposed works would be lawful and did not therefore require a formal planning application. No evidence has been provided with regard to the works at number 6. Other examples of roof alterations in surrounding streets have also been identified but no details have been provided. There is therefore no evidence before me to suggest that the council has acted inconsistently with regard to the current proposal. The alterations to 2 and 6 Windsor Road have not materially changed the characteristics of this street and as planning permission is required in this case, the proposal must be considered on its own merits and in light of the current development plan policies.
 8. In conclusion, as the matters put forward in support of the proposal do not outweigh my concerns, I dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR