
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2nd December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/16/3160588
17 Barnet Gate Lane, Barnet EN5 2AA

- 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 & Mrs Raj Bagal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 16/4010/HSE, dated 17 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front extension at 17 Barnet Gate Lane, Barnet EN5 2AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/4010/HSE, dated 17 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed: unnumbered site location plan, BGL-173, BGL-17, BGL-172, BGL-171.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling set within an established residential area. The dwellings between 15a and 21 Barnet Gate Lane are set back from the main road frontage with driveways and front gardens present and there is a staggered building line to the frontage of these properties.
 4. The appeal proposal would provide a front extension to cover almost the entire width of the property. However, given the modest depth and single storey nature of the proposal, it would be proportionate in scale and form to the host dwelling. My attention has been drawn to Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (SPD) 2013. Paragraph 14.28 states that large
-

front extensions will not normally be permitted because of their effect on the street scene and character of the area in general. The Council state within the officers delegated report that the extension cannot be considered to be large and I would also agree this to be the case. Paragraph 14.29 goes on to identify a number of principles which should be observed for front extensions. As a result of the size, scale and design of the proposal, it would in my view meet these design principles. As such, I can see no material conflict with the SPD in this regard.

5. The Council have referred me to the existing staggered frontages of detached dwellings along Barnet Gate Lane. However, in my view the proposal would not cause material harm to this existing staggered relationship given the location of Nos 15 and 19 neighbouring the appeal site.
6. I therefore conclude the proposal would not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with policies DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies (DMP) 2012. This policy advises, amongst other things, that proposals should preserve or enhance local character and respect the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding streets. The proposal would also accord with the broad strategic objectives identified by policy CS1 of the Core Strategy (CS) 2012 as well as policy CS5 which relates to protecting and enhancing Barnet's Character to create high quality places.

Conditions

7. A standard condition limiting the life of the permission is necessary. I also agree that it is necessary to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have also included a condition to require the materials proposed to be used on the extension hereby permitted to match those on the host property.

Conclusion

8. I therefore conclude that having considered all matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR