



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/23/3334828

First Floor Flat, 29 Sutton Road, Muswell Hill, Barnet, London N10 1HJ

- 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 Dariusz Szczupal against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/3420/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as an extension to roof involving rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion to the first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the decision was made by the Council, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published (19 December 2023). This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No.29 Sutton Road is a two-storey semi-detached building which has been converted to flats. The building has a two-storey outrigger to the rear, with hipped roof, which is shared with its semi-detached pairing No.27 Sutton Road (No.27). A flat roof dormer is located on the main roof to the rear. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. While there is some variety in design and form, the prevailing scale is one of two storey building, many of which have outriggers to the rear. The appeal building is located in a group of semi-detached buildings (Nos.19-29 Sutton Road) which are all of similar form and design. A number of buildings in the surrounding roofscape have been extended with alterations to their main roof, although the roof of outriggers remain largely unaltered.
5. The proposed roof extension would be constructed above the outrigger, abutting the existing rear dormer. The extension would have a flat roof design where its height would protrude above its ridge line of the outrigger. The design, height and depth of the extension would contrast markedly with the

hipped roof design of the outrigger, appearing as a bulky and discordant addition to the building. Further, the position, scale and design of the extension would result in an imbalance of the symmetry in form of the shared outrigger with No.27, which would exacerbate the visual incongruity to the development.

6. I acknowledge that the front façade of the building would be unaffected, and therefore the effect on Sutton Road itself would be limited. However, there is nothing before me to indicate that an assessment of the effect of a development, on design grounds, should be limited solely to public areas. Furthermore, the fact that the site does not lie within a Conservation Area, does not lessen this consideration. The extension would be clearly visible from nearby properties, adjacent private gardens and the garages to the rear of Nos.31-35. From these areas, the protrusion of the extension above the outrigger roof would result in a prominent development that would fail to harmonise with the surrounding roofscape.
7. It has been suggested that a number of buildings along Sutton Road have been extended in a similar manner to that proposed. While that may be so, these do not lie within the visual context of the appeal building or the surrounding roofscape. Those other roof alterations on Sutton Road, which are visible within the context of the appeal building, are mainly limited to the main roofslope, with any outriggers generally appearing unaltered. Finally, the extent of landscaping between within the rear gardens of Sutton Road and Wilton Road, which lies to the rear, limits the visual relationship between the rear roofscapes of these two streets. Therefore, I do not find other developments in the surrounding area to be directly comparable in context to the appeal proposals which, in any event, I have considered on its individual merits.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012); Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012); and, D3 of The London Plan (2021). Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver sustainable development that is of high-quality design which respects the local context. The development also fails to adhere to the guidance contained within the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: The Residential Design Guide (2016) which requires extensions to be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR