



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3345724

2 Brockley Hill, Stanmore, Barnet HA7 4LS

- 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 & Mrs V Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 24/0676/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as "two storey front and side extension following demolition of existing single storey garage; new front entrance and porch; part single, part two storey rear extension with lantern rooflight to single storey element; associated alterations and extensions to roof including increase in ridge height, creation of new crown roof with dormer windows to front, rear and side elevations plus rooflights to side elevations; changes to fenestration to side elevation at ground floor level (facing No.3); alterations to front garden including new hard and soft landscaping, new vehicle and pedestrian gates."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The Council appear to accept that the majority of the alterations and changes proposed in isolation would be acceptable but have issue with the cumulative effect with particular regard to the design of the roof. On which, therefore, my recommendation will focus, with specific regard to the raising of it and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a detached dwelling of substance and scale which has a mix of roof lines, types and shapes which lends a pleasant informality to what appears to be a largely unaltered original period design. The varied roofline particularly adds significant visual interest and lessens the overall presence of the building. Whilst the wider street scene is far from uniform, these elements, coupled with the overall height of built form, present a homogenous feel to the street scene which, accordingly, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The accumulation of works to the unit would result in a raising of and fundamental change to the roofline of the building, losing much of the interest in its relief. This additional scale, much wider span and singular nature of the roof would, along with the infilling nature of the extensions in totality, subsume much of the building's high quality original features. The increase in height, whilst marginal in the grand scheme, would stand the resulting building out against others in the street scene detrimentally affecting its homogenous relationship therewith. The substantial hedging to the front boundary of the appeal site would limit the visibility of the changes in the public realm but would not, given the extent of the works proposed, obscure it entirely. Even if it were to, this would not justify the harm the scheme would cause to the building itself.
6. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012, Policy CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and the Barnet Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guidance 2016 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

7. There are alterations to the dwelling's roof which could be carried out under the permitted development regime. By the appellant's admission, these could include large additions which would not be sympathetic to the building or the area. Such works may be carried out if the appeal is unsuccessful. Be this as it may, I have not seen any further information on an alternate proposal which might allow me to ascertain whether the scale and design thereof would be sufficiently comparable to that of the appeal scheme. Such that I could ascribe more than limited weight to it as a fallback position.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan by virtue of the above harm. This is a matter to which I attach substantial weight. I have been given no other sufficiently compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR