



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23RD December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3282421

17 Ibsley Way, Cockfosters, Barnet, EN4 9EY

- 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 Meera Shah against the decision of The London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/3784/HSE, dated 8 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension including conversion of the existing garage into a habitable room. New roof to existing garage and insertion of a door and window to replace the existing garage door. New front entrance canopy and access steps. Insertion of single-storey rear infill extension to the existing rear extension. Removal of door on the flank elevation. Insertion of new window to the flank elevation of the property at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey front extension including conversion of the existing garage into a habitable room. New roof to existing garage and insertion of a door and window to replace the existing garage door. New front entrance canopy and access steps. Insertion of single-storey rear infill extension to the existing rear extension. Removal of door on the flank elevation. Insertion of new window to the flank elevation of the property at first floor level, at 17 Ibsley Way, Cockfosters, Barnet, EN4 9EY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/3784/HSE, dated 8 July 2021, subject to the following conditions
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Existing Block Plan; Proposed Block Plan; Drawing Numbers 17/01, 17/02 and 17/03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that the description of the development was changed following the submission of the planning application. I have used the revised description in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling, which is situated within a residential estate. A number of the dwellings (including the adjoining property at number 19 Ibsley Way) have been altered and extended since they were originally built. These alterations/extensions include first-floor additions at the front of the dwellings.
5. The proposal contains a number of different elements (as described in the heading), including a small infill extension at the rear and a two-storey front addition above and to the side of the existing garage. A new entrance canopy would also be built on the front elevation. The front extensions have been designed to mimic the appearance of number 19, although there are minor differences.
6. I note that the Council has no objection to the rear infill extension. This would be a minor addition to the property and would not have any material impact on the appearance of the dwelling, nor would it affect the living conditions of the occupants of number 19.
7. The main concerns of the Council relate to the scale and appearance of the front extensions. The Council considers that the proposal would conflict with Policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012 and Policy CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2012. These policies seek to ensure a high standard of design and to protect the character of the area. I consider these to be consistent with the provisions of paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework), which also states (amongst other things) that developments should be sympathetic to local character and be visually attractive.
8. I have also taken into account the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: – Residential Design Guidance 2016 (SPD). This states, amongst other things, that large front extensions will not normally be permitted, because of their effect on the streetscene. However, where such extensions are acceptable in principle (as is the case here), the SPD provides guidance in aspects of the design and position of windows etc.
9. I acknowledge that the change to the appearance of the front elevation would be significant and that the two-storey extension would be visually prominent in the streetscene. Whilst it would be slightly wider than the existing extension at number 19 (to facilitate entry into a bedroom), this would not be particularly noticeable to most people.
10. I consider that the proposal would not be unduly different in appearance when compared to number 19 and it would not be unacceptably harmful to the appearance of the appeal property or the streetscene. In that regard, there would be no conflict with the relevant policies of the Development Plan or with the Framework, as referred to above.

Other Matter

11. I have noted that the side wall of the extension will be adjacent to a first-floor bedroom window of the appeal property. Whilst this would affect the outlook from that window and also the amount of natural light received, I am not persuaded that a reduction in the width of the extension by 0.42m (as recommended by the Council's officer) would make any real difference.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included these in my decision. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and the list of approved plans, a condition is also imposed requiring the use of matching external materials. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR