
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2019

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3233738

345 Watling Avenue, Burnt Oak, Edgware HA8 0NF

- 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 Mrs Andrea Corr against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/2128/HSE, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the whether the development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Watling Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a timber clad, two-storey semi-detached dwelling. It is located on Watling Avenue which is a busy route leading to the Burnt Oak Broadway/Watling Avenue Local Centre. It is in the Watling Estate Conservation Area (CA) which is characterised as covering a large residential area with two commercial centres and a range of other uses. The design and layout of the residential areas are influenced by the Arts and Crafts and Garden City movements.
4. One of the key characteristics of the CA is the relief and order created by the deliberate positioning of buildings, for example, setting short terraces back from their neighbours in the street behind an area of open space. This serves to break long views of rows of residential properties. Also, one of the key features is the space between properties. This arrangement is demonstrated adjacent to the appeal site, where a row of terraced properties is set back behind an area of open space exposing the gable elevation of the appeal property to the street-scene and a gap between the residential properties is maintained.
5. It is this gable elevation onto which the side extension is proposed. Its unaltered form and the separation with the adjacent property positively contributes to the character and appearance of this part of the CA. In the immediate area other properties with this arrangement have also been unaltered on their exposed gable elevation.

6. The proposed side extension would severely disrupt this positive feature and weaken the significance and appearance of the relief area. The side extension would be visible from long range views on Watling Avenue and by reason of its design and siting, would appear prominent and as an incongruous addition to the street-scene.
7. The rear extension would be less prominent. It would be partially visible from the street-scene, but views would be limited. Using materials to match, I find that this element of the proposal would have a neutral impact on, and thereby perverse, the character and appearance of the CA. However, as these two elements of the development are not separate, I am required to conclude on the proposed development as a whole.
8. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Watling Estate CA. Thus, it would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2012) and Policies DM01 and DM06 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (2012). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is of a high quality and standard of design and preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the historic suburban environment, including CAs.
9. The development would also be contrary to the Watling Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2007) that sets out the significance of the CA and the management of development within it.

Other Matters

10. I have been referred to other examples of side extensions that have been built at properties in the surrounding area, however I find that the appeal property, particularly its gable elevation is more significantly exposed and prominently positioned in the street-scene than the examples given. Also, I have considered the appeal on its own individual merits.
11. I acknowledge the personal circumstances put forward by the appellant regarding extending the property, however these do not outweigh the harm I have identified with the proposal.
12. The appellant has referred to discussions with the Council during the application process. These matters are not however relevant to the planning merits of the appeal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. Having regard to paragraph 196 of the Framework, I find that the harm to the CA is relatively localised and therefore the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. I do not, however, find that this harm is outweighed by any public benefits of the proposal.
14. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR