



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2019

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/19/3237732

31 Stonehaven, Totteridge Village, Whetstone, London N20 8PN

- 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 Ms Anne West against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref: 19/3970/HSE, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of conservatory and erection of two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of conservatory and erection of two storey side extension at 31 Stonehaven, Totteridge Village, Whetstone, London N20 8PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/3970/HSE, dated 18 July 2019, 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 strict accordance with the following approved drawings: Site Location Plan; 487619-1 Existing Plans and Sections; 487619-2 Proposed Plans and Sections; 487619-3 Existing Elevations; 487619-4 Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The external surface materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The use of the extension hereby permitted shall at all times be ancillary to, and occupied in conjunction with, the main building and shall not at any time be occupied as a separate unit or dwelling.
 - 5) No site works - including any temporary enabling works, site clearance and demolition - or development shall take place until: (a) details of temporary tree protection have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and; (b) the scheme of temporary tree protection as approved under this condition has been erected around existing trees on site. This protection shall remain in position until after the development works are completed, and no material or soil shall be stored within these fenced areas at any time.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a single storey garage and garden areas. It is located within the CA.
4. The CA comprises a ribbon of development clustered along the A5109 Totteridge Village road. The CA's significance lies in its evolution from an agricultural settlement to a stopping point for the bishops of Ely, and subsequently to what the CAA describes as an area of exclusive property within reach of central London, in a countryside setting. Several small lodges and cottages were built during the 18th and 19th centuries, adding variety to the area. Within this context, the appeal site contributes positively to the significance of the CA as a relatively smaller dwelling, constructed of traditional materials, which contributes to the variety of the CA and its heritage character.
5. The appeal property is located to the north-west of rows of large detached dwellings which face onto Totteridge Village road. It is situated down a curved driveway off the road, within a cluster of dwellings of less uniform pattern and size than the rows described above.
6. The proposed two-storey side extension would increase the width of the original building by approximately just over a quarter. This is within the context of guidance in paragraph 14.15 of the London Borough of Barnet's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016) (RDG) which allows for the possibility of an increase in width of up to half.
7. The proposed two-storey side extension would modestly increase the bulk and variety of form of the taller north-eastern 'end stop' of the building. In replacing the single-storey conservatory, it would also result in a minor reduction in the size of the garden.
8. Nevertheless, the following factors would, in combination, enable the proposed extension to be acceptably subordinate to the original building, and assimilate acceptably within the site and area: its lesser ridge height and depth, in comparison to the adjoining elevation of the host building; the proposed matching of wall, roof, window and door materials to the host building; and the variety of roof lines on other buildings in the host cluster of dwellings, which contribute to the site's context. Moreover, the proposal would be visually contained from views from Totteridge Village road, the approach to St Andrews Church and the wider extent of the CA by the following factors: the curving drive; the substantial evergreen vegetation and fencing along the site's front boundary; its setback from the road; and its location in a slight dip.
9. The proposal would meet with the requirement in paragraph 14.16 of the RDG for side extensions to be set back from the front main wall of the existing house by at least 1m, and set down from the ridge of the main roof by at least 0.5m.
10. Whilst the host building has intrinsic architectural value, it is not listed and is not highlighted in the CAA as a positive unlisted building. The proposal would

not harm the most notable views and vistas of the CA, as described in section 4.2 of the CAA. Furthermore, it would replace a conservatory which does not especially echo the original building's heritage aesthetic.

11. I appreciate the Council's concern about pressure to enlarge smaller properties which are characteristic within the Totteridge Village area, as identified in section 6 of the CAA, in relation to Area 3 of the CA. Nevertheless, having assessed the proposal on its own merits, taking the above together I find that it would preserve the significance of the CA, resulting in no harm to its character or appearance.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and that any harm to an asset should require clear and convincing justification. Whilst the proposals would not result in an enhancement to the CA - and thus not accord with the element of Policy CS1 of the London Borough of Barnet's Core Strategy (2012) (CS), which seeks the enhancement of conservation areas - the factors outlined above would ensure that the proposals would preserve the significance of the CA, resulting in no harm to its character or appearance.
13. As such, in conclusion, the proposed development would accord with Policy CS5 of the CS and Policies DM01 and DM06 of the London Borough of Barnet's Development Management Policies (2012). Moreover, it would broadly accord with the guidance in paragraphs 14.15 and 14.16 of the RDG. The policies and guidance, when taken together, seek to ensure that development is of appropriate design and appearance to conserve or enhance the historic environment. The policies are broadly consistent with the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, with great weight given to the asset's conservation.

Conditions

14. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by Planning Practice Guidance. They have been broadly found to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. I have made some minor drafting changes to suggested conditions in the interests of precision. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. Conditions regarding materials and tree protection are required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. A condition covering use of the extension is necessary to safeguard living conditions of residents and the character of the area.

Conclusion

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

William Cooper

INSPECTOR