



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 June 2024

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2024

Appeal A Reference: APP/N5090/W/24/3339122 **74 Wood Street, Barnet, EN5 4BW**

- 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 Mr Tony White against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application reference is 23/4534/FUL.
The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Appeal B Reference: APP/N5090/Y/24/3339123 **74 Wood Street, Barnet, EN5 4BW**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tony White against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
 - The application reference is 23/4535/LBC.
The works proposed are single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building and is in a conservation area I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issues

4. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, '74 Wood Street including the western boundary wall and south-east pier' (Ref: 1064817), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wood Street Conservation Area ('the Conservation Area').

Reasons

5. The appeal property, listed in 1957, is an early 19th century suburban villa which has been in use as a veterinary practice since the early 20th century. It has a largely unaltered symmetrical principal elevation overlooking a large front garden. The building has been subject to several previous extensions in both the 19th and 20th centuries. These including a long mid-19th century single

storey pitched roof former stable/carriage range, a late-20th century flat roofed extension in the north-west part of the site and an early 20th century single storey extension with corrugated metal covered roof adjoining the western elevation of the building's main range. These extensions have subsumed a substantial amount of the space around the original building, including land at the west of the curtilage, the remainder of which provides parking and a service yard.

6. Despite the later additions, I find the special interest of the listed building, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with its architectural and historic value, as a noteworthy example of a 19th century former suburban villa, including its architecturally balanced symmetrical principal elevation. The remaining space around the building in its yard and frontage, although it has changed over time, makes a positive contribution to its setting, which contributes to its understanding and special interest.
7. The Conservation Area runs generally east to west following the route of Wood Street and incorporates several side streets and spaces in proximity of it. Wood Street was formerly part of an important medieval east-west route and at its eastern end, connected to the High Street, was also part of the Great North Road. The former market located at the junction of the routes to the north and west became a key supplier of London's meat livestock. During the 18th century the area became a popular stopping off point for the coaching trade. Housing on Wood Street developed westwards from the medieval core, including several urban villas such as 74 Wood Street. The single storey almshouses on either side of the appeal site are also important parts of the Conservation Area.
8. The significance of the Conservation Area, insofar as it relates to these appeals, is primarily associated with the evidence of the historic residential, commercial and institutional development of the area, including a rich variety of building styles and uses of generally consistent quality. The prevalence of hedgerows and trees on street frontages, along with large open spaces create a verdant setting to the buildings adding to the significance of the area. Despite the several additions made to it, the appeal building and its landscaped frontage contributes positively to the historic fabric and significance of the Conservation Area.
9. The proposed extension would be attached to the existing single storey range in the northwest corner of the site. In comparison to the previously dismissed scheme¹ that incorporated a mansard roof, the extension would have a single mono-pitched roof slope that would adjoin the pitched roof of the existing range. The roof would be lower than that to which it would be attached, but the extension would add to the existing extensions with roof forms that conflict with the traditional roof forms of the main building.
10. The extension, of a considerable footprint and massing, would also further reduce the contribution made by the open space within the yard on this side of the listed building. This would further congest and clutter the setting of the building and diminish the legibility of the earlier phases of the building. Whilst the appellant refers to previous extensions set forward in the area to the west of the building, there is no evidence of a building in the same position as the current proposal and, in any case, it would provide little justification for extension taking account of the existing layout of built form within the site.

¹ APP/N5090/W/22/3294492 & APP/N5090/Y/22/3294495

Consequently, whilst the proposal would not directly affect the principal elevation or the space in front of it, it would undermine the historic and architectural integrity of the listed building.

11. I consider below the matter of public visibility below with regard to the Conservation Area. In any case, in so far as the listed building appeal is concerned, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building or any of the curtilage structures can be gained.
12. Since the previous appeal decision, the list description for this building has been updated on 15 August 2023 and includes reference to features of the building stated as not being of special architectural or historic interest. Such features referred to in the listing description include the existing range to which the proposed extensions would adjoin. Notwithstanding this, whilst I acknowledge that the proposal would not directly affect the original 19th century historic fabric of the building, for the reasons set out above the proposal would still undermine the historic and architectural integrity of the listed building.
13. For the above reasons, the proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the special interest of the building.
14. In the context of the Conservation Area, the extension, whilst set well back from the frontage of the property, would be visible in its immediate context from Wood Street and the lane leading to it and Coe's Alley. It would therefore have a moderate degree of prominence within the Conservation Area and taking account of its harmful relationship with the host building as set out above, it would fail to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
15. I have given the harm to these designated heritage assets considerable importance and weight.

Planning balance

16. Paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. Paragraph 206 goes on to advise that any harm to, or loss of, significance of a designated heritage asset through its alteration or destruction should require clear and convincing justification. Given the proposal would not harm any significant historic fabric and would represent a relatively modest addition in the context of the Conservation Area as a whole, I find the harm to both the listed building and Conservation Area to be less than substantial in this instance, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
17. Under such circumstances, paragraph 208 of the Framework states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes, where appropriate, securing the optimal viable use of the heritage asset. The proposal states that it would provide for a CT (computed technology) scanning facility that would help to diversify the existing business, provide an enhance veterinary service for customers, offer out-patient services to local practices and increase retention of qualified staff and generate more revenue to help the continued operation of the business. Also, as noted in the

previous decisions, there would be short-term economic benefits of limited weight associated with the construction period of the extension.

18. These collectively amount to significant public benefits. However, I consider that the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets would outweigh the public benefits. I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building and would neither preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and would be contrary to the relevant heritage and design aims of Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document September 2012, Policies DM01 and DM06 of the Barnet Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document September 2012, the Barnet Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance October 2016 and the Framework.
19. I do not consider the other policies referred to by the Council in its decision notices to be of particular relevance in this case as they are primarily strategic policies which have little bearing on the proposal.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR