

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/W/23/3321922

8 Wildernesse Close, Edgware, Barnet HA8 9GP

- 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 A Kennedy against the decision of the London Borough of Barnet Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0647/HSE, dated 15 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a shed for the storage of bicycles and other mobility devices; storage of multipurpose items; and workspace for hobby and other crafts.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the grade II listed building and its setting.

Reasons

3. These residential properties were created following permission in 2013 to convert the grade II listed abbey to residential use. The permission included conversion and new build elements. A timber bin store was included to serve the development and is located in the narrow strip of land to the east of the access and to the south of the current proposal, near the southern elevation of the abbey. This proposal would result in a new building within this same strip of land. It would provide for ancillary domestic storage and other uses as set out in the description of development. Clearly, considerable effort has been made to ensure that it would be of a good standard of construction and the design details would to help assimilate it into this landscaped area, particularly the green roof and climbing planting.
 4. The existing bin store is a functional rather than an attractive feature that detracts from the setting and appearance of the listed building. It is also in a more prominent position. The proposed building would individually, have a less adverse impact than the bin store. It would however increase the amount of development within this landscaped area which is important to the setting of the building. The area retained for landscaping along this boundary is already limited by the parking area in front of the new build houses and the parking
-

area for this property. Given that the setting of the listed building is already highly constrained due to the proximity of the boundary to the east, this narrow area of landscaping has considerable importance.

5. The proposed building would further reduce the perceived influence of landscaping, despite the climbing plants and green roof. Given the position of the bin store and despite the separation between them, this new shed would appear as a consolidation of development within this strip. It would further erode the positive benefits of the landscaping along this boundary. I am also concerned about its position so close to the residential entrance. It would not preserve or enhance the setting of this listed building and it would result in harm to it. I am mindful of the legislative duty set out in Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as revised, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and its setting.
6. I have taken into account the private location of these properties and the limited access to the side of the building. I note the lack of objection recorded by each of those that would experience it. Although the proposal would not have a wider impact on the character or appearance of the area, it would be contrary to the heritage aspirations of policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 which seeks to proactively protect and enhance listed buildings. Although the building itself is proposed to be of a high quality construction for a garden shed, given its context, it would conflict with the design and heritage requirements of policies DM01(b) and DM06(a) of the Local Plan Development Management Policies 2012, as it would fail to preserve or enhance local character; or have regard to the local historic context. As these policies generally accord with both the design and heritage requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them full weight.
7. The *Framework* is clear that if a development would lead to less than substantial harm to a heritage asset, which would be the case here, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. Although the proposal may encourage the use of bicycles; and would generate investment into the local economy during construction, the public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified. Having had regard to the statutory requirements and to the design and heritage objectives of both the development plan and the *Framework*; and in the absence of any other matters that weigh sufficiently in favour of the proposal, I dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR