



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/22/3306266

29 Gallants Farm Road, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 8ET

- 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 Karol Kankowski against the decision of London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 22/2786/HSE, dated 24 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and extension and replacement with single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing conservatory and extension and replacement with single storey rear extension at 29 Gallants Farm Road, East Barnet, Barnet EN4 8ET in accordance with the terms of the application, 22/2786/HSE, dated 24 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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 following approved plans: Block Plan Block_GFR; Existing Ground Floor Plans 29GFR/BR/001; Existing Elevations 29GFR/BR/002; Existing Roof Plan 29GFR/BR/003; Proposed Floor Plans 29GFR/PP/004; Proposed Elevations 29GFR/PP/005; Proposed Section 29GFR/PP/007.
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.29 Gallants Farm Road (No.29) is a semi-detached dwelling, formerly a bungalow that has been extended to provide a first floor within the roofspace. To the rear, No.29 has an existing conservatory and canopy structure. It is proposed to demolish these existing structures and construct a single storey

rear extension across the full width of the dwelling, projecting 3m from the principal rear elevation.

4. The guidance in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (2016)* (SPD) is that the depth of a single storey rear extension normally considered acceptable for semi-detached properties is 3.5m, taken from the original house. The evidence provided by the appellant includes an historic map from 1951 which shows No.29 with an outrigger to the rear along the common boundary with its attached neighbour at No.27. It is likely therefore that No.29 has previously been extended to the rear (infilling the space adjacent the outrigger) and the proposed extension would therefore exceed the 3.5m guidance (at least in part).
5. However, the extension would not significantly project beyond the existing building line formed by the conservatory and canopy therein retaining a good sized garden. The extension would have a flat roof of only 3m in height and although extending the full width would appear a sympathetic, appropriate addition to the host dwelling. Visually it would improve the current disjointed appearance to the rear elevation. Noting that the SPD is guidance and not policy, the limited conflict with it would not justify the appeal being dismissed.
6. The SPD also provides guidance that side extensions should not be more than half the width of the original house. Although the proposed extension would essentially be to the side of the original outrigger of No.29, this guidance serves to protect the streetscene and I do not consider it relevant to this case.
7. I note from the aerial view of the appeal site submitted by the appellant that whilst the proposed extension would project beyond the rear building line of its immediate neighbours, it would not be to a significant extent. Further, there is some variation in rear building lines on the west side of Gallants Farm Road, including No.33 Gallants Farm Road, to which the appellant refers. The proposed extension would not therefore result in any particular unbalancing of properties along Gallants Farm Road or cause harm to the character of the locality.
8. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed rear extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Consequently, it would accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy DM01 of the Barnet Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and Policy CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (2012) which together require high quality design that preserves local character and context.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and a condition listing the approved drawing numbers for the avoidance of doubt. A condition to ensure the external materials match those of the existing house is also necessary to ensure that the development does not harm the appearance of the host dwelling or its surroundings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones, INSPECTOR