



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/24/3347187

27A Millway, Mill Hill, Barnet, London NW7 3QR

- 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 Shafad Koloth against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/1782/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion including a hip to gable and rear dormer window, and 2 front facing roof lights.
-

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. The appeal site relates to a first floor flat which is located within a building which originally formed a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Notwithstanding the sub-division to flats the building retains its original appearance as a semi-detached property. The dwelling and its semi-detached pairing No.25 and No.25A Millway (hereafter referred to as No.25), have a hipped roof, each with prominent front gable and bow window across ground and first floor levels. The front door to all units are recessed under a shared arched canopy. The front elevation of the semi-detached pairing is symmetrical in form and appearance which provides a well-balanced and harmonious frontage to Millway, and contributes positively to the overall character of the area.
4. The surrounding area predominantly comprises a mix of two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying design and form. A number of properties have been subject to roof alterations including hip to gable extensions to semi-detached properties, and various side facing dormers.
5. The scheme proposes the creation of a hip to gable roof extension by continuing the existing ridgeline to the side elevation and following the existing roof pitch. The lack of set back or set down means that there would be no subordination to the existing roof, which together with the creation of a large side gable would result in the loss of visual legibility of the original hipped roof form.

6. The extension would result in significant additional mass at roof level, adding greater horizontal and vertical emphasis to the building. As such the roof extension would visually compete with the important architectural features of the front façade, diluting the visual prominence of the front gable and bow windows. In turn, the alteration to the roof would result in the building becoming bulkier and visually more prominent than No.25. This would create significant imbalance in the visual symmetry of the semi-detached pairing, eroding its visual harmony and the positive visual contribution of the pairing within the street.
7. I acknowledge that there have been a number of roof alterations within the street including hip to gable extensions to semi-detached properties. During my site visit I took the time to walk along Millway and observe the alterations which have occurred, including that cited by the appellant at No.56 Millway (No.56). I do not have full details of that case or the reasons behind the decision. Nonetheless, the design differs insofar as the side gable of the roof extension is set away from the eaves, meaning some legibility of its original roof form is retained. In addition, the decision was made prior to the adoption of the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: The Residential Design Guide (2016) (the RDG), and The London Plan (2021) (the LP). Therefore, I do not find the development at No.56 to be directly comparable and, in any event, I have considered the appeal on its individual merits.
8. With regard to other roof alterations, I do not know the full circumstances under which the alterations have materialised, although it is likely that some may have occurred as a result of permitted development rights. While there has been some change to the street in this regard, the general character of the street remains largely one of well-balanced semi-detached properties. The appeal proposals would increase the proportion of imbalanced semi-detached properties on Millway, eroding further the positive visual characteristics of the street. Therefore, I do not consider other roof alterations, including that approved at No.56, sets a precedent for a development which I have found to be harmful.
9. 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 LP. Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver sustainable development that is of a high-quality design which respects the local context.
10. The development also fails to adhere to the guidance contained within the RDG which requires extensions to be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building. The RDG also identifies that hip to gable extensions should not unbalance a pair of semi-detached houses.

Other Matters

11. I sympathise with the appellant's aspirations to extend the property in an affordable manner to accommodate for a growing family. Nevertheless, it is likely that these benefits to the appellant would be short term when compared

to the permanent harm to the host building and street scene. This is therefore not a significant factor in my overall assessment.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR