



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/23/3326735
247A East End Road, LONDON, N2 8AY

- 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 Ms Patricia Hickey against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 23/1855/FUL.
 - The development proposed is roof extension including hip to gable, rear dormer window and 3no. front facing rooflights. Extension to existing flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host property, group of terraced properties and the local streetscene.

Reasons

3. East End Road is a residential street, consisting of terraced, semi-detached and detached housing. The local pattern of development is relatively regimented with building heights ranging from two- to three-storey with some including front dormer windows at second floor. The local streetscene includes hipped roofs, gable ended properties and some hipped roofs that have been extended with hip-to-gable additions. The appeal site is an end terrace building within a row of three properties. The terraced block is two-storey, with a hipped roof and a small-hipped roof over projecting bay windows, in a curved row creating a rather unique roof form. The terraced row includes decorative brick detailing shared with the appeal dwelling and these stand together as a complementary grouping. As a result, the appeal dwelling complements the design of the adjacent dwellings within the terraced row making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposed roof addition would extend the hipped roof into a gable end and add rear and side flat roofed elements. These additions would not complement the original form of the building. The proposed gable would appear as a discordant and awkward addition, having a harmful effect on the form of both the end property and the conjoined terraced block.
5. Furthermore, the flat roofed addition, to the side of the gable, would be overt. This would be visible in the street in a prominent position, slightly ahead of the front sloping roof line of the building despite the presence of the taller gable

end of No 249. The impact of the proposed extensions would be exacerbated by the site's position in a curved section of the highway, increasing views from the southwest.

6. The property has been previously extended to its side and rear, these additions have flat roofs and do not follow the form of the main terraced row. However, these are relatively subtle additions, having a negligible effect on the surrounding streetscene. The hip-to-gable additions observed locally are limited and in less prominent locations than the appeal site. Therefore, these do not form a key characteristic of the area. Moreover, despite the use of matching materials, the proposed development would not integrate well with the existing building, due to its form and overall mass.
7. The Council's Residential Design Guidance (SPD)[2016] advises that rear dormers should not occupy more than half the width or depth of the roof slope to be subservient additions. The proposed rear dormer would occupy almost the full width of the rear roof in conflict with this advice. The marginal set back, from the eaves and ridge, would reveal only minimal areas of the existing roof slope and the roof additions would not therefore appear subordinate to the existing building. Although only partially visible from Prospect Ring, this further impact would not complement the overall form of the building in combination with the proposed additions. Other rear flat roofed dormer windows are noted on the south side of East End Road and near to the site. However, these appear subservient within their roof slopes and do not seem directly comparable to the proposal.
8. It is noted that the proposed scheme would provide for a growing family with a need for a larger dwelling. However, this would be a private benefit that weighs only modestly in favour of the proposal.
9. Accordingly, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property, the terraced row and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with policy D3 of the London Plan [2021], policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy [2012], policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies [2012] and the Council's guidance Residential Design SPD [2016]. These seek, among other matters, for development to respond to local distinctiveness and be based on an understanding of local characteristics.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with policies of the development plan when taken as a whole and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR