
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/21/3279599

221 Blundell Road, Edgware HA8 0JL

- 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 Greame Bourne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/1001/FUL, dated 19 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new two storey dwelling; alterations to no 221 including new entrance door to the front of the property and demolition of single storey rear extension; associated refuse/recycling area and cycle store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are;
 - The effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area
 - The standard of accommodation to be provided.

Reasons

Conservation Area

3. The appeal relates to this semi-detached house which sits adjacent to the junction of Blundell Road with Watling Avenue. The property faces Blundell Road, with its side elevation facing towards the wider and busier Watling Avenue. The site sits within the Watling Estate Conservation Area.
4. The submitted documents for the appeal indicate that the residential area was generally constructed in the 1920s and provides for 'working class' housing with elements inspired by the garden suburbs. The area contains numerous examples of open and green spaces which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, along with the attention to the arrangement of buildings at junctions, to create space, as recognised in the conservation area Character Appraisal Statement.
5. The appeal property has a wide gap between the existing side elevation and the boundary with Watling Avenue, as well as a generous rear garden area.

This is consistent with the spacing of the 3 other houses which sit on the other corners at this cross-roads junction. The wider and busier road at Watling Avenue contains other open spaces nearby.

6. The proposal would reduce this spacious side area significantly. It would bring the 2 storey side wall close to the boundary with Watling Avenue and I consider that this would unacceptably erode the important spaciousness exhibited by this and other properties at this junction. The appellant has drawn my attention to the development at No 205/207 Blundell Road where a similar form of extension was constructed. Firstly, this was undertaken prior to the designation of the conservation area and secondly, it is not adjacent to a wide junction, as with the appeal site. Other examples of developments have also been referred to by the appellant and I had the opportunity to see these at my site visit. Whilst there have undoubtedly been changes within the conservation area, none of the examples are similar to the appeal scheme and so do not have any direct effect on my reasoning. In relation to this issue, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Watling Estate Conservation Area, contrary to Policies CS5, DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Local Plan.

Standard of Accommodation

7. The Council indicates that the proposal would provide a 2 bedroom, 4 person dwelling. The Council applies the minimum space standards as set out in the London Plan and based on the Nationally Described Space Standard. This requires a dwelling of this type to have a minimum of 79sqm internal floorspace. The appellant indicates that it would have 72sqm floorspace and so is clearly below the minimum standard. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies CS5, DM01 and DM02 of Barnet's Local Plan and the London Plan.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and would fail to provide residential accommodation of a suitable size, conflicting with the policies set out above. There are no matters which are sufficient to outweigh that harm, as a result, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR