



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3342839

27 Hartland Drive, Edgware, Barnet, HA8 8RJ

- 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 Steve Steinhart against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 24/0378/HSE, dated 30 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is a part single part two storey rear extension with associated access steps. Roof extension including raising of ridge and insertion of rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal property has been the subject of several recent planning applications. Permissions include approval to raise the ridge of the roof and add a small dormer¹, along with an extant permission for a part two storey rear extension².

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling situated within a residential area characterised by the presence of similar two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings.
5. The appeal property, like neighbouring dwellings, is set back from the street behind a short driveway and garden area and has a longer garden to the rear. Hartland Drive in this area comprises a wide street, where the presence of grass verges and street trees combines with that of small front gardens and hedgerows to present a pleasant green and spacious character.

¹ Reference: 21/5825/HSE.

² Reference: 23/4795/HSE.

6. During my site visit, I observed that whilst many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, such changes generally appear in keeping with host dwellings and the surrounding area. This and the regular set-back, spacing and numerous similarities in the design and materials of dwellings, including the use of brick and tile, the presence of two storey front gables and generally similar roof heights, combine to provide for an attractive degree of uniformity.
7. The proposed development would involve substantial increases to the height and overall bulk of the main roof. I find that this, together with a significant alteration to the angle of its pitch, would result in the appeal dwelling's roof drawing attention to itself as an unduly dominant feature.
8. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the roof appearing incongruous within a location where in general, the area's roofscape makes a positive contribution to its identified attributes.
9. Further to the above, I consider that the proposed rear dormer, which would extend across much of the rear roof slope, would be of such dimensions as to add significantly to the overall bulk of the proposed roof. Its large dimensions and boxy appearance would exacerbate the harm arising from the proposal's bulkiness and would result in the roof appearing top heavy.
10. Consequently, the proposed dormer would add to an overall development proposal that would appear unsympathetic to and overwhelm, the appearance of the host dwelling.
11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); to Policy DM01 of Barnet's Adopted Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012); and to Barnet's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

12. In support of the proposal, the appellant draws attention to other developments in the wider area. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that the circumstances relating to these other developments are so similar to that proposed as to provide for direct comparison and notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and this is not a factor outweighed by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR