



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024

by Joanna Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/23/3336177

29 Crewys Road, Cricklewood, Barnet, London NW2 2BD

- 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 Lesley Ruth McIlmoyle against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 23/2041/FUL.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "to create a loft conversion with rear dormer with 3no. Velux roof lights to the front elevation and 2no. Casement Windows in the face of the dormer and both parapet walls to be built up to form the side of the dormer."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof extension involving rear dormer with 2no. casement windows, 3no. front facing rooflights and raising of the parapet wall at 29 Crewys Road, Cricklewood, Barnet, London NW2 2BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/2041/FUL, subject to the following three conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 611 01 Existing Floor Plans; 611 02 Existing Elevations & Section; 611 03 H Proposed Floor Plans; 611 04 I Proposed Elevations & Section; Block Plan (unnumbered); Location Plan (unnumbered).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The banner heading's description of development is from the application form. However, I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice in my formal decision as it accurately reflects the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a first floor flat within a mid-terraced building at 29 Crewys Road close to the junction with Llanelly Road. Crewys Road is characterised by mostly terraced dwellings of several similar designs set along strong building lines to either side of the road. This provides an overall coherence of design, despite there being a mix of brickwork, render and stone cladding and some front dormers. At the rear of the buildings, there is considerably less uniformity as a result of a significant number of extensions and dormer windows of different designs.
5. No 29 has an existing rendered two-storey rear outrigger with a parapet wall, as well as a single storey rear and side extension to the ground floor flat. A narrow balcony and a set of external stairs provides access from the first floor flat to their rear garden. Beyond the rear garden, the Granville estate regeneration scheme is partially built out.
6. The proposed development would comprise three front rooflights and a rear dormer window. The slate tile-clad dormer would cover the full width and height of the rear roofslope and would have two casement windows of varying dimensions. The parapet walls would be built up in brickwork.
7. The Council has not raised any concern with regard to the size, positioning and number of rooflights. Having assessed the plans and considered the wider streetscene, I am satisfied that the front rooflights would not have any negative effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. The Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (October 2016)(RDGSPD) sets out guidance on a range of matters including dormer roof extensions and is applied to both flats and single family dwellinghouses. The RDGSPD states that adequate roof slope above and below the dormer is required on semi-detached and terraced properties, the dormer extension should be set in at least 1 metre from the party wall, flank wall or chimney stack. The RDGSPD also asserts that dormer roof extensions 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. It goes on to confirm that to retain the balance of the house, the dormer roof extension should not normally be wider than the window below it and the dormer cheeks kept as narrow as possible. For smaller enclosed houses, such as terraces consideration and allowance will be given to internal workable space and Building Regulation requirements for wider roof extensions.
9. The rear dormers along Crewys Road are abundant in number and many cover the full width and height of their respective rear roofslopes. They are also diverse in their colour and fenestration, with varying designs and levels of glazing. In the context of the sheer number and range of large rear dormers I saw during my site visit to Crewys Road, and notwithstanding that some will have been delivered under permitted development or in advance of the RDGSPD, the proposed development would be neither bulky nor insubordinate.
10. The Granville estate regeneration would introduce a terrace of housing with a flank wall facing the rear roofslope of No 29. While it was apparent from my site visit that Llanelly Road would be likely to see increased use for access to the housing on the new Granville estate, the proposed development, including its raised parapet walls, would be partially masked from view by the existing

two-storey outrigger at No 29 and would be less noticeable for this reason than some of the other dormer extensions on the opposite side of Llanelly Road. Furthermore, it would be separated from Llanelly Road to a limited extent by neighbouring 31 Crewys Road. As such, it would not be visually dominant or overbearing within the streetscene and would not detract from the character and appearance of the area.

11. Both the Council and the appellant have drawn my attention to dormer development carried out either under permitted development or under previous planning applications at numerous addresses on Crewys Road, but no plans of these properties have been provided. It is therefore not possible to compare the proposed development with the aforementioned schemes.
12. While the proposed development fails to comply with the RDGSPD, it is necessary for me to assess the proposed development in the context of existing development on Crewys Road. I also note that the appellant made a previous refused application (Ref: 22/4987/FUL), but that application and its plans are not before me, and no amended plans have been provided.
13. Although the appeal property is a flat and would not have permitted development rights at this point, the proposed development would potentially not constitute permitted development due to its design and layout. I also recognise that any noise concerns would be addressed by Environmental Health legislation and that the highest and medium priorities for homes in Barnet are for four and three bedroom properties respectively. However, this does not alter my findings on this appeal.
14. In conclusion, and notwithstanding that the proposed development would not accord with the RDGSPD, the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not therefore be contrary to Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2012) and Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (September 2012), which address the need to protect and enhance Barnet's character to create high quality places and provide high quality design. I have had regard to London Plan 2021 Policy D3 and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which deal with design. The Council has also referred to London Plan policies D8, HC1 and SI 6, but these do not appear to be directly relevant.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for clarity and certainty. A condition requiring materials of the proposed development to match the existing building is also necessary to ensure consistency with the character and appearance of the host building.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would accord with the development plan when it is read as a whole. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

Joanna Gilbert

INSPECTOR