
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2019

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3235640
62 Goldbeaters Grove, Edware HA8 0QA

- 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 Zahid Gran against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 19/2262/HSE, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and relocation of entrance door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - a) Whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Watling Estate Conservation Area (the CA); and,
 - b) The effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of 64 Goldbeaters Grove, with regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character or appearance of the CA

3. The appeal site lies on the eastern side of the CA, which is a large residential area that was built in a single phase between 1924 and 1930. The significance of the CA lies in its distinctive layout, form and building designs, which were heavily influenced by the Garden City movement. The layout is characterised by short, often symmetrical, terraces of houses set back behind front gardens with hedged boundaries. The houses display a uniformity in scale and form, with materials and detailing based on the architectural style of the Arts and Crafts movement. One of the most notable features of the estate is the treatment of road junctions where, in general, there is a grassed area with buildings turned, angled or staggered around the corner.
4. The appeal property lies on the southern end of a terrace of six houses. The terrace is symmetrical and displays the distinctive architectural features that characterise the CA, including paired doorways within recessed arched entrances, and decorative brick string courses. As part of the design concept of the original estate, the side elevations of the houses at each end of the terrace

contain the front door and windows, so that the buildings address both street frontages. The side elevation of the appeal property looks out over the characteristic grassed open space at the junction of Goldbeaters Grove and Watling Avenue. The house is therefore part of a terrace that makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.

5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension would project further at the front of the property and would have a separate hipped roof with a lower ridge. As a result, even if matching materials were used, the symmetry of the terrace would be affected. The front part of the extension would be an obvious addition, which would disrupt the unifying appearance of the roof that covers the terrace. Furthermore, the relocation of the entrance door and the insertion of two additional windows in the front elevation would upset the balanced arrangement of doors and windows in the terrace. As well as a loss of symmetry, the side elevation of the extension would only have one first floor window, so the house would lose its characteristic visual relationship with the grassed open space. The proposals would therefore harm the contribution that the house and terrace make to the significance of the CA.
7. The harm that would arise would be localised, and therefore the impact on the CA, as a whole, would be less than substantial within the meaning of Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, less than substantial harm does not mean less than substantial weight should be afforded to this harm. Rather, as the Framework sets out, great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The Framework advises that less than substantial harm should be considered in a balanced manner, against any public benefits associated with the development. The only public benefit arising would be through any additional employment during the construction works. However, this would be modest, and would not therefore outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the CA.
8. The council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (the SPD) advises that setting side extensions back from the front building line can help to reduce their visual impact on the street scene. The SPD advises that two-storey side extensions should normally be set back one metre from the main front wall of the existing house. The proposed extension would not comply with this guidance, as it would be flush with the front of the existing terrace. Consequently, although part of the extension would have a lower roofline in line with the SPD guidance, its prominence in the street scene would emphasise its unbalancing effect on the terrace, therefore contributing to my findings of harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
9. To conclude on this issue, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, the development would be contrary to Policies CSNPPF, CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) (2012) (the Core Strategy) and Policies DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) (2012) (the Local Plan). These policies seek, through a plan-led approach, to protect and enhance Barnet's

character through high quality design, and to preserve or enhance its Conservation Areas.

Living conditions

10. 64 Goldbeaters Grove is attached to the appeal building and lies to the north. As it is part of the symmetrical terrace, it has the same eaves and ridge height, and the main front and rear walls of the houses are in alignment. The appeal property, however, has a lean-to single storey extension across its rear elevation that projects about 3 metres and abuts the boundary. Due to the orientation of the properties, this extension has some impact on the light to, and outlook from, the ground floor window in the rear elevation of No 64. However, as the roof of the extension does not rise far above the existing boundary fence/hedge, this impact is very limited.
11. The proposals include a new single storey extension across the rear of the house, which would project about 3.5 metres. The SPD advises that rear extensions of 3 metres are normally considered acceptable for terraced properties. It does not say that deeper extensions will necessarily be unacceptable, but it advises that the depth and/or height of the extension should not cause a significant sense of enclosure, or loss of outlook from, or light to, principal windows of habitable rooms of neighbouring properties. As the proposed extension would only extend about half a metre further, and it would only be a little higher than the existing extension, it would not have a significantly different impact on the light reaching the window at No 64, or the outlook for occupants of that property. It would not result in a noticeably greater sense of enclosure than already exists.
12. I therefore find that the development would not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupants of 64 Goldbeaters Grove. In this regard, the proposals would comply with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM01 of the Local Plan. These policies aim, amongst other things, to protect the gardens of residential properties and to ensure adequate daylight, sunlight and outlook for adjoining occupiers.

Other Matters

13. I am mindful of the appellant's assertion that constituent parts of the overall extension may be carried out as permitted development. However, I must consider the proposal before me, which is for the entire development.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR