



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3351513

97 Harrowes Meade, Edgware, HA8 8RS

- 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 and Mrs Y and R Benouaich against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 24/1857/HSE.
 - The development proposed is rear ground floor infill extension, with hip-to-gable and rear dormer loft extensions. Front plane of existing roof extended at same pitch to raise ridge. Loft conversion and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 97 Harrowes Meade is a two storey detached house in an established residential area which is characterised by two storey houses in a variety of sizes, but in a broadly similar architectural style. No. 97 is one of a number of 'smaller' houses in the vicinity and has larger houses to either side. Many of the houses throughout this area have been extended.
4. The relevant policies in this case include D3 of the London Plan (2021), CS1 and CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) and DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (the DMPDPD) which, among other things, require development to be of a high quality design which optimises the capacity of sites and responds to local distinctiveness. Core Strategy policy CS NPPF is a broadly strategic policy which refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) and provides for granting permission where local policies are out of date unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guide* (2016) (the SPD) provides detailed advice on residential extensions.
5. The Council raises no objection to the ground floor rear extension and I see no reason to disagree with this view.

6. I consider that the proposed alterations to the roof would result in a disproportionate addition to the house because of the cumulative effect of the hip to gables and the overall size of the flat roofed rear dormer which would extend from the new main roof ridge and across the full width of the extended roof.
7. An increase in roof height alone would not look out of place in the context of the street scene since the properties on either side are larger overall and, in the case of No. 95, of a similar height to that proposed. However, the proposed design of the gables in combination with the remnant of the hip would appear awkward and ill-proportioned and together with the large and boxy form of the proposed dormer would result in a discordant feature which would be at odds with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building.
8. I have taken account of the variety of roof extensions both in the immediate vicinity and further afield. Many of these are not sympathetic to the building itself or the street scene, particularly where large rear dormers extend directly from the main roof ridge and are flush with the gable end wall. I consider that these examples do not justify allowing an incongruous feature such as is proposed here.
9. I conclude that the overall impact of the various alterations to the roof would result in a disjointed form of development which would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the house itself and the street scene. It would be contrary to policy D3 of the London Plan, policies CS NPPF, CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy and DM01 of the DMPDPD and the SPD.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR