
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2020

by S. Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/20/3257795

53 Barnfield Road, Edgware, London HA8 0AZ

- 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 Hektor Kraja against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 20/2419/HSE, dated 30 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations at 53 Barnfield Road, Edgware, London HA8 0AZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/2419/HSE, dated 30 May 2020, subject to the conditions set out as follows:
 - 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 accordance with the following approved plans: PB-20/53BARN/01, PB-20/53BARN/02A, and PB-20/53BARN/10.
 - 3) Prior to their use in the extension hereby approved, details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.
 - 4) The roof of the extension hereby permitted shall only be used in connection with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including its effect on the significance of the Watling Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The site of No 53 Barnfield Road is within the Watling Estate Conservation Area (CA). This CA derives its significance from its distinctive urban layout and design, together with its characteristic architectural features, amongst other things. Barnfield Road is in a predominantly residential area, although there is a school and a parade of shops close by also. No 53 has a black stained timber weatherboard front elevation, which is a feature highlighted in the CA Character Appraisal Statement.
4. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, (the Act) is relevant to this appeal as it requires special regard to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas in the exercise of planning functions.
5. The National Planning Policy Framework also advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraph 193 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. In this case, the proposed development is a single storey rear extension of approximately 4.5m in depth. The Barnet Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (SPD) states that for terrace housing, such as No 53, the normally accepted depth should be 3m. However, this is not an absolute limit which the SPD sets out. Furthermore, in paragraph 14.22 the SPD sets out what a single storey rear extension should ensure when it is designed, such as limiting the potential effect on neighbour living conditions, or that the extension would not be overly bulky or prominent, for example.
7. The Council has not raised any issue to do with impact to neighbour living conditions, which given the limited extensions height is a reasonable conclusion. However, the Council is concerned with the visual impact of the extension.
8. The extension would be large, although not such that it would appear over-scaled or prominent as an extension to this dwelling. It would be to the rear of the house and would have a low profile due to its flat roof. There may be some public views from Market Lane, but this is essentially a lane where there are multiple properties backing into it, many with what appears to be various large garages or storage buildings. Viewed within this context the proposed extension would not appear a dominant feature. It would also be next to a neighbouring extension which is very similar (although I note this was built under superseded planning policy). As such, I do not regard the proposed extension as being incongruous within the street scene.
9. Even if viewed from public vantage points, the proposed extension would not appear as a visually harmful feature within this setting. However, it would likely be at least partially screened by surrounding fences and vegetation within the appellant's and neighbouring gardens. As such, the proposed extension would preserve the character and significance of the CA appropriately.
10. In conclusion, the proposal accords with policies DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Development Management Policies DPD (2012), and policy CS5 of the Barnet

Core Strategy (2012). These policies require development to respect local context and distinctive local character, whilst preserving or enhancing Barnet's heritage including Conservation Areas in line with their significance. Furthermore, I conclude that the proposal generally accords with the aims and objectives of the Barnet Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance, in terms of guidance for rear extensions, even if the proposed extension does project more than the 3m normally considered acceptable in this document.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the National Planning Policy Framework. The conditions I have included from the recommended list have been subject to some alterations to improve clarity and ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework and PPG.
12. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance. The appellant in the Application Form states that the extension would have 'Siding Clad Walls' and 'Common Roof Tiles', but this does not appear as indicated on the submitted plans. Therefore, details of the materials should be required by condition.
13. Finally, a condition has been attached requiring that the extension roof is not used as a balcony or similar, to safeguard neighbour amenities.
14. I have not included any condition to remove permitted development rights for the proposed extension as I do not regard there to be the exceptional circumstances for such a condition. This is a single storey extension proposed and I do not regard a restriction on features such as new windows as necessary.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and considering all matters raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out in Paragraph 1.

Steven Rennie

INSPECTOR