



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by L Clark BA(HONS) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/23/3326642

14 Leaside Crescent, Golders Green, Barnet, London NW11 0DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Breuer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 23/1284/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a hip-to-gable and flat roof rear dormer and three (3) front skylights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a hip-to-gable and flat roof rear dormer and three (3) front skylights at 14 Leaside Crescent, Golders Green, Barnet, London NW11 0DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/1284/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PR-P001, PR-P002, PR-P003, PR-P004, PR-E001, PR-E002, PR-S001, PR-S003 and PR-3D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The roof to the adjoining property (No 12) differs from that shown on drawings submitted by the appellant. Plans show a hipped roof with a wrap-around dormer to the side and rear, however on-site, I saw it to have a gable, rear dormer and two roof lights to the front roof slope. I have therefore assessed the appeal based on my observations.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property (No 14) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which has been subdivided into two flats. Leaside Crescent contains a mix of dwelling

designs and incorporates a step to both the roofscape and building line. A number of properties within the immediate vicinity display alterations to the roofs and include hip-to-gables, side dormers, and a front dormer to No 8. These variations to the roofs are seen within the street scene and result in disruption to any symmetry or rhythm which may have existed. Rear dormers are visible between properties on Leaside Crescent, and large rear dormers are clearly visible within nearby neighbouring streets.

5. The Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016) (SPD) states, amongst other matters, that proposed hip-to-gable roof extensions should not unbalance a pair of semi-detached houses, should not reduce the degree of visual separation between houses or glimpsed views from the street, and not appear out of character within the streetscape.
6. Whilst I have not been provided with the circumstances surrounding the modifications to the roof of No 12, the roof is nevertheless visible within the street scene and forms part of the prevailing character. The proposed development would therefore replicate the gable to the roof of No 12. I am therefore satisfied that the change from hip-to-gable would rebalance the appearance of the properties from the street.
7. The neighbouring dwelling No 16 is set lower than No 14 and its roof retains its hipped design. This change in level and roof design would result in a degree of separation being retained. Furthermore, given the step-in building line, the gables of Nos 8/10 and 20/22 are prominent features within the context of the street. Whilst these dwellings are different house types, they do provide context to the prevailing character against which the proposed development would be viewed alongside.
8. The SPD states, amongst other matters, that dormers should not normally be wider than the window below it and the dormer cheeks be kept as narrow as possible. The proposed dormer would obscure almost the entire rear roof slope and therefore does not meet the SPD's design objectives.
9. I saw there are several similar dormers within the vicinity which provide a backcloth to Leaside Crescent. Even though the proposed dormer would exceed the recommended width set out in the SPD, it would be set in from the gable and down from the ridge. Given its rearward location and the presence of several similar dormers, it would replicate the prevailing character and have a limited impact on the street scene.
10. The Council contend that a number of properties which have modified the roof from hip-to-gable have done so exercising their permitted development rights, and the numbers are not so consistent that they constitute the defining character of the surrounding area. I acknowledge that No 14 contains two flats and therefore does not benefit from permitted development rights, however, I saw that a number of properties within the immediate vicinity do have gables. Even if they were undertaken within permitted development, these developments form part of the established character and as such, their presence lends weight to my conclusion.
11. I conclude that whilst the proposed rear dormer would not meet all aspects of the SPD, this conflict does not affect my conclusions that the proposed development, would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan

(2021) or Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012), which collectively seek to ensure development respect local context and distinctive local character creating places and buildings of high-quality design. There would also be no conflict with Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012) which seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure that development preserve or enhance local character and respect the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition specifying the plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
13. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition relating to materials is required.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

L Clark

INSPECTOR