



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3349424

53 Flower Lane, Mill Hill, Barnet, London NW7 2JN

- 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 Adefemi Adewole against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/1641/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as two storey side and first floor rear extensions. Roof extension including raising of roof ridge height and rear roof dormer extension including installation of two rooflights to front roofslope. Changes to fenestration to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No.53 Flower Lane (No.53) is a two-storey detached dwelling with shallow pitched hipped roof with characteristic splayed eaves. The dwelling is located at the junction of Flower Lane and Parkmead Gardens. This corner plot location results in the dwelling occupying a prominent position within the surrounding street scene. The dwellings on Parkmead Gardens, along with 51-57 Flower Lane, are all similar in design and appearance, which includes uniformity in their roof form. The relationship between No.53 and No.51 Flower Lane (No.51) creates a visually balanced entrance into Parkmead Gardens. These similarly designed dwellings on Flower Lane and Parkmead Gardens form the visual context of the appeal site.
4. The appeal proposals include various extensions and alterations to the property. The Council have raised no concern with regard to the side and rear extensions or alterations to fenestration. Given the scale and siting of the extensions, and the relationship of the alterations with the street, I have no reason to disagree with their findings in this respect. The Council's sole concern relates to the alterations to the roof.
5. The increase in height of the roof would not be significant in isolation. However, the roof alteration includes an increase in the pitch of the roof, which results in an increase in the width of the ridgeline to the front and rear elevations. These

alterations would result in a significant increase in mass and give a greater horizontal emphasis to the roof of the property. As such the dwelling would visually appear top heavy with a bulkier appearance. This significant change in roof form would result in the loss of important character and architectural style of the dwelling. This would be further exacerbated by the apparent loss of the characteristic splay to the roof pitch over the eaves.

6. The steeply pitched roof and bulkier form would result in a dwelling that would markedly contrast with the uniformed roofs of the adjacent dwellings. To this end the dwelling would appear more prominent within the street and visually at odds within the surrounding context. Furthermore, the scale and mass of the roof would disrupt the visual balance and harmony with No.51 and dilute the sense of arrival into Parkmead Gardens.
7. I acknowledge that the application relates to an amendment of previously refused scheme¹. I also note that the Council have confirmed that the specific reasons for refusal of that scheme, which was also dismissed at appeal², have been addressed. However, while that scheme included an increase in roof height, it is evident from those refused plans³ that the roof pitch and resultant scale and mass of the roof was not significantly altered. Therefore, the roof form and character of the dwelling did not appear to result in a harmful change, nor did it result in a roof which would significantly contrast with the surrounding roofscape. Therefore, I find the roof forms between both schemes to be materially different and, in any event, I have considered this appeal 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

¹ LPA Ref: 23/4740/HSE – Refused 9th November 2023

² Appeal Ref: 3341166

³ 23/4740/HSE - Refused Plan Drawing No 05 - Proposed Elevations