



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2022

by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/21/3286563

8 Stanley Road, East Finchley, London N2 0NB

- 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 Peter Van Weperen against the decision of London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 21/3427/HSE, dated 21 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as “two storeys rear and side return with modern look”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side/rear extension at 8 Stanley Road, East Finchley, London N2 0NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/3427/HSE, dated 21 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0418_LP_00, 0418_BP_00, 0418_00_00, 0418_01_00, 0418_03_00, 0418_55_00, 0418_55_01, 0418_55_02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall be those specified on the application form and approved plans.
 - 4) No groundworks associated with the development hereby permitted shall take place until detailed design and method statements for all of the foundations and ground floor structures, or for any other structures below ground level, including piling (temporary or permanent), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which:
 - provide construction details on the proposed extension
 - provide details on the use of tall plant/scaffolding
 - demonstrate access to elevations of the building adjacent to the property boundary with London Underground can be undertaken without recourse to entering railway land
 - demonstrate that there will at no time be any potential security risk to the railway, railway property or structures
 - accommodate ground movement arising from the constructionThe development shall thereafter be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statements, and all structures and works comprised within the development which are required

by the approved design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in paragraphs of this condition shall be completed, in their entirety, before the extensions are brought into use.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although the appeal form refers to 6 Stanley Road, I note the appeal site is 8 Stanley Road, as stated on the planning application form and submitted plans, considered by the Council, and confirmed at my site visit.
3. I note that the existing and proposed front elevation shown on drawing number 0418_55_00 does not appear to accurately show the front elevation of the existing building. However, noting that the development does not affect the front elevation, I am satisfied that this discrepancy does not affect my ability to determine the appeal.
4. I have used the description of development stated on the planning application in the heading above. However, in allowing the appeal I have used the description of development stated by the appellant on the appeal form and the Council in its decision notice as it more clearly describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal site is the last in a row of eight semi-detached dwellings at the end of Stanley Road of a style typical of the early 20th Century. Behind their rear gardens are modern 3-storey houses, and beyond them high-rise apartment blocks. On the opposite side of Stanley Road, and within the surrounding area there are two and three storey flat developments of various designs. A railway in a cutting abuts the existing building's side boundary, and schools are accessed by a pedestrian bridge over the railway. The area is therefore one of mixed character.
7. The development is a rear and side extension of contemporary design with large glazed areas with zinc profiling, brick panels, and vertical slatted cladding beyond brick and glass. Internally it provides a larger first floor rear bedroom and improved and additional ground floor living space.
8. Given the mixed character of the area, the way the development would be viewed would change depending on the vantage point. From Stanley Road the development would be barely visible, and would have no material impact on the character and appearance of the existing building, or the row of which it is a part. There would also be very limited views of the development from the schools to the north, through trees.
9. From private areas to the rear of the appeal site, it is clear that most, if not all, dwellings in the row have been extended or modified. Large dormer roof extensions are particularly prominent. The Council states that no other dwellings have two-storey rear extensions. However, I note that the existing building currently has a narrower 2-storey outrigger than other dwellings in the row, resulting in an asymmetrical pair at the rear, and I see no reason why a

wider 2-storey extension should not be acceptable here. The development would be seen as a distinctly modern, flat roofed addition, predominantly of glass. It would be bold, and different in style to the existing dwelling, but in my view would complement the traditional red brick dwelling.

10. From the railway bridge the development would be seen through galvanised safety mesh, and it would appear above the railway cutting, with much of the ground floor glazing obscured by the boundary fence. The first-floor extension would appear as a significant feature in this view, but would not be unduly bulky, being seen as a small part of the existing side elevation. Despite the juxtaposition of heights and forms, the modern design would provide a positive feature in this relatively modest view of the building's red brick gable and flank walls and grey roof extensions.
11. The appeal site's location, at the end of the group of dwellings and adjacent to the railway line, affords it a degree of design flexibility. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (2016) (SPD) states that extensions should be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building, and discourages flat-roofed two-storey extensions. I note the contrast between the design of the existing building and the modern features proposed, including the overhanging glazed first floor at the corner of the building, the flat roof, modern materials, and slatted wooden cladding. However, the modern design intentionally introduces distinctive features, including the glazed areas at the rear and the cladding at the side, which in my view would relate sympathetically to the existing building in this location. Given its location at the end of the row adjacent to the railway line, it would also have very little effect on the character and appearance of other dwellings in the row, or the varied character of the wider area.
12. In conclusion, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area and would accord with Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) DPD¹ (2012) (DM DPD) Policy DM01, which relates to high quality design, Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) DPD (2012) Policies NPPF, CS1 and CS5 which seek to promote sustainable development and protect and enhance local character and amenity, and with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks well-designed places. It would also accord with relevant guidance in the SPD. I have not found DM DPD Policy DM06, which relates to heritage and conservation, relevant to the development.

Conditions

13. Considering the Council's proposed conditions, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for certainty, and a condition specifying that the materials shall be as stated on the application form and plans to ensure they respect the character of the existing building. I have also imposed a condition to secure the safe and uninterrupted operation of the adjoining railway during and after construction works. Where necessary for clarity and precision, I have slightly amended the wording of the proposed conditions.
14. It is not necessary to impose a condition preventing the flat roof from being used as a balcony or terrace as there would be no means of access to it.

¹ Development Plan Document

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole, relevant policies of the Framework, and all other relevant considerations, the appeal is allowed.

Peter White

INSPECTOR