



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2025

by **P Barton BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/25/3361816

58 Gloucester Road, New Barnet, Barnet EN5 1NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Davidson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref is 24/5095/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage at rear of 58 Gloucester Road in between 46 & 47 Eversleigh Road and construction of new detached three bedroom four-person house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has confirmed that the policies from Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (September 2012) and Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (September 2012) referred to in the Decision Notice have been superseded by policies from the Barnet Local Plan 2021-2036 (March 2025) (BLP), which was adopted on 4 March 2025. The main parties to this appeal were provided with the opportunity to comment on the BLP in the context of this planning appeal.
3. Appeal decisions must be based on the policies from the development plan prevailing at the time of determination. Policies referred to in the reasons for refusal, relating to the planning application subject to this appeal from the Barnet Local Plan 2012, are no longer relevant and are disregarded. A matrix detailing which BLP policies replace which old Barnet Local Plan 2012 policies is provided at Appendix B of the BLP. The Council has also indicated the particular policies of relevance to this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is an L-shaped parcel of land that has a narrow frontage to Eversleigh Road, forming the rear-most part of the plot to 58 Gloucester Road, with a detached single garage structure positioned between 46 and 47 Eversleigh Road.
6. Eversleigh Road is a residential street consisting mainly of detached and semi-detached 2-storey houses and bungalows. There are a few exceptions including 3 and 4-storey flatted developments to the western end of Eversleigh Road, where it meets with Lyonsdale Road, and a 2-storey synagogue located approximately halfway on the north side of Eversleigh Road.
7. The age and architectural style of the houses along Eversleigh Road are varied and they generally sit within plots of modest width with gaps between them. These factors all contribute to a strong degree of harmony that influences the overall character and appearance of this suburban location.
8. The width of the appeal site facing Eversleigh Road is significantly narrower than the plots broadly found in the locality. Whilst the proposed dwelling would occupy most of the width of the site between Nos. 46 and 47, it would still appear very narrow in comparison to the other houses on the street. Moreover, very little spacing would be left between the new dwelling and its neighbours, thus compounding the arrangement and giving it a cramped appearance.
9. I recognise that there is diversity in the house designs along Eversleigh Road, but there is a general consistency in the width of the plots, which the proposal would not reflect. Moreover, there are some narrow gaps between some of the houses at ground floor level but in these circumstances, I observed more spacious gaps at first floor level. The proposed house would have a comparable height and building line to those along Eversleigh Road, and its design would add to the diversity of architectural styles in the area. Nevertheless, these elements would not mitigate the narrowness of the plot.
10. I observed rear dormers on a number of houses along Eversleigh Road. The lack of spacing between the new dwelling and Nos. 46 and 47 would mean that the rear dormer to the proposed house would not be visible from Eversleigh Road. However, it would be visible from neighbouring houses and gardens, and its dominance to the rear slope would exacerbate the harm I have found with the proposed dwelling's narrow and cramped appearance.
11. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would conflict with Policy CDH01 of the BLP and Policy D3 of the London Plan, which require a design-led approach that includes development proposals to respond sensitively to the distinctive local character and design, building form, patterns of development, scale, massing, roof form and height of the existing context. It would also be contrary to Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide, which advises that the Council will not accept design that is considered inappropriate to its context.
12. The Council has also referenced Supplementary Planning Document: Sustainable Design and Construction in the Decision Notice relating to this matter. However, this document focuses on, amongst other things, space standards, accessibility, energy, noise and water conservation, and is not relevant.

Highway safety

13. The Council indicates the site has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 3, which is a moderate level of public transport accessibility. 58 Gloucester Road has no off-street parking to the front of the property, and it is argued that the occupiers do not use the existing garage and parking space, off Eversleigh Road, and instead park to the front on Gloucester Road. The proposal would remove this off-street parking provision and provide no alternative for No. 58.
14. Photos taken in the evening claim to show available on-street parking along Gloucester Road. Whilst off-street parking for the new dwelling is provided, the removal of the existing off-street parking to No. 58 forms part of the proposed development. Policy TRC03 part A of the BLP expects residential developments to provide parking in accordance with the standards, which ranges between 0.75 and 1 space depending on the number of bedrooms in the dwelling with a PTAL rating of 3.
15. Policy TRC03 part J states that where on-street parking surveys are undertaken, the scope of the survey should be agreed in advance with the Council. The supporting text to this policy highlights that the Council promotes the use of the parking survey methodology set out in the guidance produced by LB Lambeth, which is an industry accepted method for parking assessments.
16. Therefore, I do note that the photos appear to show capacity for on-street parking, but without a parking assessment undertaken in accordance with an industry recognised methodology, I cannot conclude with reasonable certainty that the proposed development would not represent a hazard to highway users by reason of an increase in parking pressure.
17. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of parking. This would conflict with Policy TRC03 of the BLP, and Policies T4 and T6.1 of the London Plan. Taken together these, amongst other things, expect residential development to provide parking in accordance with the standards, the scope of on-street parking surveys should be agreed in advance, and proposals should not increase road danger.

Other Matters

18. I acknowledge that the Council can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. The proposed development would provide an additional dwelling in a location close to public transport links, that would increase biodiversity on the site, incorporate carbon dioxide emission reduction measures as well as incorporate water saving and energy efficiency measures.
19. I also recognise that Policy H2 of the London Plan requires Boroughs to proactively support well-designed new homes on small sites in order to, amongst other things, significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meet London's housing needs and achieve targets for small sites as a component of the overall housing targets. Furthermore, the policy also highlights that Boroughs should recognise in Development Plans that local character evolves over time and will need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate additional housing on small sites.

20. However, the benefits associated with the proposed single dwelling are outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and to highway safety.

Conclusion

21. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations put forward in support of the proposed scheme do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

P Barton

INSPECTOR