



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2022

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/21/3288479

160 Blundell Road, Edgware HA8 0JG

- 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 Ion Pancec against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application Ref 21/4397/FUL, dated 7 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed was originally described as planning approval is requested for the proposal of a single storey rear wrap-around extension to a ground floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, having regard to the Watling Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a ground floor flat. The flat forms part of a two-storey end-of terrace building which benefits from a large side garden. To the front, side and rear of the building is an open grassed amenity area with footpaths. The appeal site is located within the CA.
4. This part of the CA is characterised by runs of residential terraces of different lengths as well as the open grassed amenity area mentioned above. The grassed area helps to create a green and open feel. The two-storey residential buildings are similar in scale, form and design. Large wrap-around extensions are not prominent within the CA.
5. The proposed single-storey, wrap-around extension would be set back from the front elevation. Although the boundary fence and vegetation limits views of the appeal site, the extension would be visible from the surrounding area, including from nearby footpaths. The proposed side elevation would be blank and would not contain any features to break up the massing.
6. The extension would result in an incongruous and unsympathetic addition due to a combination of the extension's size, width, depth, bulk, massing and design. The proposal would not respect the modest proportions of the host dwelling or the wider terrace and would appear at odds with the established pattern of development. Accordingly, the scheme would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.

7. Paragraph 199 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. Paragraph 200 goes on to advise that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. The harm arising would be localised and less than substantial in this instance, nevertheless it is of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. The appellant highlights that the extension would improve the layout of the flat. However, they have not presented any clear public benefits. Based on the evidence submitted, the public benefits would not justify or outweigh the harm to the heritage asset that I have identified, as required by the Framework.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, and it would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan (2021), Policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and Policies DM01, DM02 and DM06 of Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies (2012). These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure development proposals preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas and all development should represent high quality design. It would also conflict with the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016). This states that extensions should reflect the design of the original building, whilst having regard to the character of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, and all other material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR