

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2020

by Peter D Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3252219

42 Eversleigh Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1ND.

- 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 Ms N Shah against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0802/HSE, dated 13 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2020.
 - 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 42 Eversleigh Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0802/HSE, dated 13 February 2020, and subject to the following conditions :
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of approval.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 202002.P.001; 202002.P.003; 202002.P.102; 202002.P.302; 202002.P.303
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Eversleigh Road, where the appeal site is located, is a mainly residential road of predominantly detached houses in a range of styles and materials with no one design predominating. No 42 together with No 43 has however been built as a pair of 2 storey detached properties orientated with their timber clad gables facing the road both originally designed with a forward projecting flat roof offshoot accommodating a partly integral garage. At some point in the past No 42 has had this front projection extended partly across the frontage to provide a porch entrance. The proposal would extend this front projection across the rest of the property's frontage.

4. The section of Eversleigh Road in which the appeal site sits between the Synagogue and the block of flats further west on the road is taken up with 7 dwellings (5 detached and 2 semi-detached). Everyone of these has a front offshoot albeit to differing designs but generally adhering to a uniform building line from the front offshoot on the appeal site through to that on No 48.
5. The proposal would not project further forward than the building line already established and would not be dissimilar to some of the other front extensions on this section of the road having a flat roof.
6. I acknowledge that No 42 and 43 were clearly built as a pair to the same design however the existing extension to the projecting garage at No 42 already introduces difference between the two and given that the proposal would be to the same height, depth and flat roof form as that at No 43 I am not persuaded that the difference would be damaging to the character and appearance of the two properties or the street.
7. In any event as already stated the road has an eclectic mix of styles in its buildings and given the fact that this section of Eversleigh Road is already characterised by projecting front sections to the dwellings I am satisfied that the extension across the remainder of the frontage would not be inappropriate.
8. Viewed from the east along the road the extension would be partially screened by the boundary fence and hedging on the Synagogue boundary. It would be more open in views in the approach from the west but the extension would remain subordinate to the main house and would reflect the simple styling and the proportions of the property.
9. It has been put to me that the extension would relate poorly to the building line of the Synagogue but as all of the existing front projections establish a consistent front building line forward of the Synagogue and the extension would respect that, the point is of limited relevance.
10. I am also invited to conclude that the extension would not be well integrated with the original house. However, inasmuch as the original front projection with its flat roof accommodating the garage was clearly a conscious design decision not to integrate it into the frontage, I am not persuaded that a continuation of this design across the frontage would be unacceptable.
11. The *London Plan* at Policy 7.4 and the *Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy* at Policy CS5 requires development to respect local context and local character. Similarly, the *Barnet Local Plan Development Management Policies* at Policy DM01 requires proposals to preserve local character and respect the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets. For the reasons above the design of the proposed extension would not conflict with these policies.
12. Although the *Barnet Residential Design Guide* (BRDG) is generally cautious in respect of front extensions it does allow the possibility of front extensions in lower density residential areas on detached dwellings. Usually these are expected to take the same roof form as the main roof and fit in with the architectural style of the building. As already stated the front flat roof offshoot of the original building is part of its architectural style and therefore

the proposal to continue that roof form would be in keeping with the architectural style of the property. The advice in the BRDG is therefore met.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. The Council suggested a number of conditions, which I have considered in the light of the advice in the Framework and *Planning Practice Guidance*. A condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary in the interest of certainty. Control of the materials to be used on the exterior of the extension is also necessary to ensure the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings is not harmed.
14. I have considered the matters before me and, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and permission granted for the extension subject to the conditions set out above.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR