



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2024

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3346352
21 Cranbrook Road, East Barnet, EN4 8UP

- 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 Catherine Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 23/0778/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension involving hip to gable, rear dormer window with Juliette balcony and 3no front facing roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of development was changed from that appearing on the original application form to incorporate a hip to gable conversion and re-designed rear dormer. The change was agreed between the appellant and the Council and both parties have confirmed the correct revised plans. I have therefore used the amended description and revised plans in this decision.

Main Issue

3. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed roof extension, rear dormer and rooflights on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a traditional semi-detached house set on a corner plot in a street of mostly similar dwellings. It and others in the street are characterised by hipped roofs and most have a prominent, slightly projecting, feature gable. The appeal dwelling appears to have been extended through the addition of a sympathetic hip-roofed two storey side extension.
5. The proposed extension would result in the original roof being converted from its original hipped form to a gable. The hip over the extension would remain unchanged. The proposed alteration would be clearly visible from the street on the front elevation. The lack of uniformity in shape between the two parts of the roof would appear awkward and incongruous, giving the roof a disjointed appearance that would be unsympathetic to its character and appearance. Owing to the corner location of the site the alteration would also be clearly

visible from the side view and appear out of keeping with the prevailing street scene in both Cranbrook Road and Welbeck Road.

6. I note that hip to gable conversions are common in the street but these are mostly not combined with side extensions. In one example nearby, a similar dwelling to the appeal site has had a hip to gable conversion and two storey side extension but in this case the extension also has a gabled end, giving a coordinated appearance to the dwelling as a whole.
7. The rear dormer would sit within the plane of the extended original roof. It would be set down from the ridge, in from either side and up from the eaves. Whilst large, the dormer would not be prominent in the street scene and would be similar in scale to others on neighbouring dwellings nearby. Moreover, some of these are more prominent in the street scene, including one on the opposite corner of Welbeck Road. They have therefore become characteristic of the area.
8. The Council suggests that the proposed extensions and alterations would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses. Whilst that would be the case, unbalanced pairs are frequent in the street and as many hip to gable with rear dormer extensions can be carried out under permitted development rights that might be expected to continue. Hence, I do not consider this to be an unusual or unacceptable effect. Overall and notwithstanding the advice set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (SPD), October 2016, I therefore find the rear dormer and unbalancing effect acceptable.
9. I agree with the Council that the proposed front rooflights would be acceptable.
10. It is concluded on the main issue that, whilst the proposed roof lights and rear dormer would be acceptable, the proposed hip to gable alteration would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. In consequence, it would conflict with Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) (CS), September 2012, Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) (DPD), September 2012, and with the Council's SPD. Taken together and amongst other things, these expect development to be of a high quality design that respects local context, distinctive local character and appearance and the scale and pattern of surrounding buildings. In particular extensions should respect the original building in terms of form, scale and architecture.
11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR