
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/23/3329411

3 The Avenue, London N3 2LB

- 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 and Mrs J Hart against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 23/1373/HSE, dated 29 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is to erect a first-floor front extension—over existing terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to erect a first-floor front extension—over existing terrace at 3 The Avenue, London N3 2LB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/1373/HSE, dated 29 March 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 plan: Ref TA22-A100.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one half of an asymmetric 2-storey pair on The Avenue, which is a narrow residential street along which dwellings vary in age, size, and style with a staggered front build line to the road. With their clean horizontal lines, notable setbacks in the front elevations and consistent white rendered finish, the pair to which No 3 belongs has a modern style, stepped layout and a unified appearance, which is locally distinctive.

5. The proposal is to introduce a first-floor extension with a Juliette style balcony above the existing ground floor projection at the front of the appeal dwelling. The new addition would be modest in scale, width and height. Given the size of the host building, it could not reasonably be described as a 'large front extension', which the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Design Guidance* (SPD) advises will not normally be permitted due to their effect on the street scene and the character of the local area. Nevertheless, a larger dwelling would result with a new 2-storey front wall to the forward projection of No 3 that would be a prominent feature of the dwelling when seen from the road.
6. While the forward projection of No 3 would be noticeably taller and more substantive with the new built form in place, the stepped profile of the front elevation to No 3 and its attached counterpart would be retained, as would be their staggered layout and front build lines. With no increase to the building's footprint, the finished dwelling would continue to be set back from the road and so the sense of space in the local street scene would be maintained. Matching external materials would be used and the proposed flat roof form and new first floor window would be appropriate. By retaining the established build pattern of the pair and blending in with the architectural style and general appearance of the host building, the proposal would not appear awkward or incongruous, as the Council suggests, nor would it be obtrusive in the street scene.
7. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, the proposal does not conflict with Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) or the advice within the Council's SPD. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that new development represents high quality design, preserves or enhances local character and respects local context.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building. These conditions reflect those suggested by the Council in the Officer's report.

Conclusion

9. Overall, there are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR