



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2024

**by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27 September 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5090/D/24/3346128**

**1 Blundell Road, Barnet, Edgware, HA8 0JA.**

- 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 Mrs Pramila Gurung against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barnet.
  - The application Ref is 24/1102/RCU.
  - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor rear extension at 1 Blundell Road, Barnet, Edgware, HA8 0JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/1102/RCU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the following approved drawing: BDR1005 Rev 01, 1004 Rev 01, 1006 Rev 01, 1012 Rev 01, 1007 Rev 01, 1002 Rev 01, 1001 Rev 01, 1003 Rev 01, 1011 Rev 01, 1008 Rev 021, 1009 Rev 01, 1010 Rev 01 1013 Rev 01 and the Design and Access Statement.

### Procedural Matters

2. The Council's decision letter describes the extension as retrospective. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the extension has been erected on site. I shall determine the appeal on this basis.

### Main Issue

3. The site lies within the Watling Conservation Area. Section S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of such areas. From this, the representations made in writing and my inspection of the site and its surroundings, I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site, 1 Blundell Road (No1) comprises a two-storey house attached to numbers 140 and 142 Montrose Avenue. This block of three dwellings is

- located on the junction of Blundell Road and Montrose Avenue, in the Watling Conservation Area. No1 faces on to Blundell Road and is separated from the neighbouring short terrace of houses No's 3 to 9 by a wide side garden.
5. As I observed there have been numerous alterations and extensions to the dwellings in Blundell Road, and as identified by the Council rear extension are not uncommon.
  6. Due to No's 140 and 142 facing the junction the configuration of the block containing the three houses is both unusual and complex. The side/rear garden of No1 is located behind a high close boarded fence and is therefore the extension is not directly open to public view.
  7. The removal of the detached outbuilding in the garden, highlighted on the application drawings would serve to contribute to a more open and green character locally.
  8. Following the removal of a conservatory structure between the rear of the dwelling and No 140 a flat roof extension has been built onto the side and rear of original house. Although not clear from the application drawings, as I saw the street elevation of the side extension has been set back a small distance from the main façade of No 1. Thereby reducing its visual impact on the host property. Further, due to its height and the configuration of the three houses there are only very limited views of the infill section to the rear of the dwelling between the original house and No140.
  9. The extension due to its three-dimensional flat roof form and overall height when viewed from the street is, despite it being a full width addition, clearly a visually subservient structure to the host property. The face brick work contrasts in colour from the existing house and the use of white coping stones gives the extension a more contemporary appearance. Overall, therefore the extension can clearly be read from the public domain as a relatively modest contrasting modern addition. I do not consider therefore that the extension has caused harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, or the appearance of the group of buildings of which it is part.
  10. For these reasons I am not persuaded, based on my observations on site and the limited evidence to the contrary that by reason of its size, siting and design the extension appears as such an unduly prominent and incongruous addition within the street scene as to be harmful to the distinctive layout and established pattern of development of this part of the Watling Estate. Accordingly, therefore, in the context of the other changes and alterations to nearby properties, whilst I do not think that the extension has enhanced the appearance of the property and the area, it has not harm it. I have therefore concluded, on the main issue that the extension would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
  11. The proposal therefore does not conflict with the objectives of Policies D5 and HC1 of the London plan (Adopted March 2021), Policies CS NPPF and CS5 of Barnet's Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (Adopted September 2012), Policies DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Local Plan (Development Management Policies) Development Plan Document (Adopted September 2012), the Watling Conservation Area Character appraisal (2007) and the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guidance (October 2016) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of

development and the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

**Conditions**

12. The Council have, in addition to the standard time condition suggested a condition in respect of materials. However, as the development has been completed, I do not consider either of these conditions relevant in this case.
13. In the interests of certainty, I shall however impose a condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans.

**Conclusions**

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Philip Willmer*

INSPECTOR