

Location **The Surgery 27 Wood Street Barnet EN5 4BB**

Reference: **19/5176/FUL** Received: 23rd September 2019
Accepted: 25th September 2019

Ward: Underhill Expiry 20th November 2019

Applicant: DR P DESAI

Proposal: First floor side and rear extension including mansard roof with two front dormers in the front elevation.

Recommendation: Refuse

AND the Committee grants delegated authority to the Service Director – Planning and Building Control or Head of Strategic Planning to make any minor alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended conditions/obligations or reasons for refusal as set out in this report and addendum provided this authority shall be exercised after consultation with the Chairman (or in his absence the Vice- Chairman) of the Committee (who may request that such alterations, additions or deletions be first approved by the Committee)

- 1 The proposed first floor side and rear extensions, new mansard roof including front dormer windows by reason of their size, siting, scale, mass and design together with the existing additions would cumulatively constitute disproportionate, discordant and incongruous additions to the existing building which would amount to overdevelopment of the subject site and fail to preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the Grade II listed building. No public benefit has been identified that would outweigh the harm to the heritage asset. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and form of the original heritage building and the context of the site within the Wood Street Conservation Area, contrary to Policy DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Development Management Policies Document DPD (2012), Policy CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy (2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016) and the Wood Street Conservation Area Character Appraisal Statement.

Informative(s):

- 1 The plans accompanying this application are:

001, Site Location Plan, Heritage Statement, Supporting letter (25 March 2019), 440015/1 Rev B, 440015/1 Rev D, 440015/3 Rev D, 440015/5 Rev B, 440015/6 Rev B.

- 2 In accordance with paragraphs 38-57 of the NPPF, the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, focused on solutions. To assist applicants in submitting development proposals, the Local Planning Authority has produced planning policies and written guidance to guide applicants when submitting applications. These are all available on the Council's website. A pre-application advice service is also offered.

The applicant sought formal pre-application advice which was provided. Unfortunately the submitted scheme is not considered to accord with the Development Plan. If the applicant wishes to submit a further application, the Council is willing to assist in identifying possible solutions through the pre-application advice service.

Officer's Assessment

Application was withdrawn from 7th January 2020 CB area planning committee as the application was not called in by the ward councillor.

Cllr Roberts confirmed he wishes to call-in the application as the ward councillor for the reasons set out below:

The reason for this application is to provide extra space for a medical practice that will be greatly to the benefit of the local community. This is a well used medical surgery that faces increased demand for its services. The proposal will respect the conservation area and preserve the character of this Wood Street building. I request that the CB Area Planning Cttee consider this planning application in the light of the above and the clear demand for extended medical surgery facilities in High Barnet/Underhill.

1. Site Description

The Surgery is a grade II listed property which sits within the Monken Hadley and Wood Street Conservation Area.

The site is located on the south side of Wood Street.

The building is a part single and two storey end of terrace property. There is a vehicular access on the west side and parking at the rear. The property features a single storey rear extension with pitched roof.

Currently the surgery provides GP and Nurse clinics, clinical pharmacist and midwife clinics, mental health link worker and psychologist clinics, multidisciplinary team meetings and regular teaching.

The listing text states:

"Altered early C18. Two windows wide with blank recessed panel over central entrance. (Sashed windows with margin panes). Ground storey. One window wide to right of entrance, 2 windows to left. Stucco pilasters and plain pediments to all windows on front. Six panelled door - plain fanlight 2 storey with attic in tiled mansard behind parapet. Roughcast. Stair turret to rear. Later 2 storey and one storey addition on right hand side.

Listing NGR: TQ2450896433"

2. Site History

Reference: 15/04230/FUL

Proposal: Installation of air conditioning system.

Decision: Refused

Date:01.09.2015

Reference: 15/02987/LBC

Proposal: Installation of A/C system

Decision: Refused

Date: 23.07.2015

Reference: N01112J/00

Proposal: Erection of non- illuminated projecting sign.

Decision: Refused

Date: 26.09.2000
Reference: N01112H
Proposal: Replacement and treatment of defective timber and reinstatement of associated brickwork (Listed Building Consent).
Decision: Approved
Date: N01112H

Reference: N01112G
Proposal: Installation of two floodlights on front elevation at first floor level (Listed Building Consent)
Decision: Approved subject to conditions
Date: 16.03.1993

Reference: N01112F
Proposal: Dormer window at rear (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT).
Decision: Refused
Date: 12.07.1989

Reference: N01112D
Proposal: Rear extension.
Decision: Approved subject to conditions
Date: 27.08.1986

Reference: N01112
Proposal: Use of ground floor for Doctors' Surgeries.
Decision: Approved
Date: 21.06.1967

3. Proposal

The applicant seeks planning permission for first floor side and rear extensions. The extension would accommodate three surgery rooms at first floor level.

The proposed first floor side to rear extension would be sited on top of the existing single storey addition on the west side and would feature mansard roof with two front dormers in the front elevation. The roof would set back from the front elevation.

The first floor rear extension would have same eaves height as the existing first floor eaves on the east and would feature a crown roof. The first floor rear windows would match the existing windows of the ground floor.

There would be a ground floor door and a first floor window in the side elevation facing the existing vehicular access on the west. The side elevation would feature gable roof.

Cllr Roberts as the ward councillor called this application to planning committee for a decision for the reasons set out below:

The reason for this application is to provide extra space for a medical practice that will be greatly to the benefit of the local community. This is a well used medical surgery that faces increased demand for its services. The proposal will respect the conservation area and preserve the character of this Wood Street building. I request that the CB Area Planning

Cttee consider this planning application in the light of the above and the clear demand for extended medical surgery facilities in High Barnet/Underhill.

4. Public Consultation

A site notice was erected 10 October 2019.
A press notice was published 03 October 2019

Two Objection and Three supports received

Summary of Objections

- Expressed concern regarding access to parking at the rear of 27/29 Wood Street, during construction.
- concern regarding the quality of the extension befitting the Grade II listed building.
- stating Heritage statement did not justify the proposal. It fails to assess the architectural and historic interest of the listed building or measure the impact of the proposal on significance.
- In future, the practice could outgrow the extended building.
- The proposal is not appropriate to the listed building or the conservation area.

Summary of supports

- Sensible extension to a busy surgery
- It blends well with the surrounding property
- Extension would benefit all patients

Comments from Theresa Villers as listed below:

The surgery needs the additional space. The proposal would respect the conservation area and preserve the character of the listed building.

Internal Consultation

The local authorities' Heritage Officer objected to the scheme. Officers comments are integrated within the main report.

Historic England was consulted however they did not wish to comment on the proposal and authorized the Local Planning Authority in a letter dated 19th November 2019, to determine the application in accordance with national and local policies.

Internal Consultation

The local authorities' Heritage Officer objected to the scheme. Officers comments are integrated within the main report.

5. Planning Considerations

5.1 Policy Context

National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material

considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 19th February 2019. This is a key part of the Government's reforms to make the planning system less complex and more accessible, and to promote sustainable growth.

The NPPF states that 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.... being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this'. The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits.

The Mayor's London Plan 2016

The London Development Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and it sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital to 2050. It forms part of the development plan for Greater London and is recognised in the NPPF as part of the development plan.

The London Plan provides a unified framework for strategies that are designed to ensure that all Londoners benefit from sustainable improvements to their quality of life.

The London Plan is currently under review. Whilst capable of being a material consideration, at this early stage very limited weight should be attached to the Draft London Plan. Although this weight will increase as the Draft London Plan progresses to examination stage and beyond, applications should continue to be determined in accordance with the adopted London Plan.

Barnet's Local Plan (2012)

Barnet's Local Plan is made up of a suite of documents including the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Documents. Both were adopted in September 2012.

- Relevant Core Strategy Policies: CS NPPF, CS1, CS5.
- Relevant Development Management Policies: DM01, DM02, DM06.

The Council's approach to extensions as set out in Policy DM01 is to minimise their impact on the local environment and to ensure that occupiers of new developments as well as neighbouring occupiers enjoy a high standard of amenity. Policy DM01 states that all development should represent high quality design and should be designed to allow for adequate daylight, sunlight, privacy and outlook for adjoining occupiers. Policy DM02 states that where appropriate, development will be expected to demonstrate compliance to minimum amenity standards and make a positive contribution to the Borough. The development standards set out in Policy DM02 are regarded as key for Barnet to deliver the highest standards of urban design. Policy DM06 of the Council's Development Management Plan document deals with Barnet's heritage and conservation. Policy DM06 states that the special architectural and historic interest as well as the character and appearance of conservation areas should be preserved and enhanced. Planning applications which fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a heritage asset or conservation area will not be granted.

Supplementary Planning Documents

5.2 Main issues for consideration

The main issues for consideration in this case are:

- Whether harm would be caused to the special architectural or historic interest of the statutory listed building street scene and this part of the Conservation Area.
- Whether harm would be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring residents

5.3 Assessment of proposals

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 states that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The Act also requires special interest to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building and any features or architectural interest it possesses and section 66 (1) states that, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects the setting of a listed building, special regard should be had to the desirability of preserving this setting.

Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

Paragraph 190 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 193 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The NPPF defines 'significance' in its appendix as: 'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.'

Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 states that development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate and development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

Policy DM01 of Barnet's Development Management Document DPD (2012) states that development proposals should be based on an understanding of local characteristics. Proposals should preserve or enhance local character and respect the appearance, scale, mass, height and pattern of surrounding buildings, spaces and streets.

Policy DM06 of the same document states that all heritage assets will be protected in line with their significance. All development will have regard to the local historic context. Development proposals must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of 16 Conservation Areas in Barnet.

Impact on heritage assets, street scene and conservation area:

The subject building is a Grade II statutory listed building and is located within the designated conservation area. A recent pre application advise officers considered that there is likely to be limited scope to extend the building without compromising the setting of the listed building.

Councils Heritage officer was consulted on the proposal. The officer informed that, 27 Wood Street is a statutorily listed building situated within the Wood Street Conservation Area. It is the end property on a terrace of listed buildings running along the south of Wood Street. Its immediate neighbour to the west is also a statutorily listed building.

The officer informed that the first floor extension on top of the single storey element with a mansard roof at front, crown roof at the rear and gable end in the side elevation would be uncharacteristic of the listed building.

The property was extended in the past and the listing description in 1983 mentions that the building was extended prior to 1986. The proposed extension would therefore be further extension on an existing extension.

The conservation officer objected on the cumulative impact on the listed building and informs that,

"The cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes may have as great an effect on the significance of a heritage asset as a larger scale change. Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past, consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from the significance of the asset."

The officer further informs that, "Listed buildings do vary greatly in the extent to which they can accommodate change without loss of special interest. Some may be sensitive even to slight alterations. Some listed buildings are the subject of successive applications for alteration or extension: in such cases it needs to be borne in mind that minor works of indifferent quality, which may seem individually of little importance, can cumulatively be very destructive of a building's special interest."

For example, many Grade II listed buildings are of humble and once common building types and have been listed precisely because they are relatively unaltered examples of a particular building type; so they can as readily have their special interest ruined by unsuitable alteration or extension. The roof is nearly always a dominant feature of a building and the retention of its original structure, shape, pitch, cladding and ornament is important.

The proposal due to size, siting, design, bulk and excessive width is considered overdevelopment of the listed building. The proposed mansard roof with two front dormers is considered uncharacteristic for the listed building. The first floor extension would be an extension on top of a previous single storey extension.

It is noted that, most of the historic terraces that are found throughout the conservation area, tend to have a variety of differing roofscapes and a variety of front elevations which create an irregularity which is a significant feature of the conservation area, and mentioned in the Wood Street Character Appraisal. Therefore, the introduction of an uncharacteristic mansard roof to the front elevation, constitutes harm to this element of significance and to the character and appearance of this historic part of the conservation area.

Conservation officer further mentions that, there is a longstanding conservation principle that it is for an occupier of a listed building to adapt to the limits of that heritage asset and not for the heritage asset to be adapted in a harmful manner to the need of the occupier. If the heritage asset is no longer fit for the commercial purpose of the occupier, it is suggested that larger commercial premises are sought elsewhere in the town centre, particularly as there are many vacant retail units and a significant amount of new approved development which should be coming forward. More consideration should be given to these options over the harming of a statutorily listed building.

As such, the proposal is considered harmful to the significance of a listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is not considered that there is sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm and the practice could relocate elsewhere in the town centre to a less sensitive location.

In the submitted Heritage Statement, the applicant states that the proposed first floor side to rear extension would accommodate three additional consultation rooms and a w.c. The submitted statement recognises that the proposal would lead to some harm to the listed building, however mentions that the proposal would bring considerable public benefit.

However, as discussed above, the officers do not consider that there is sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm as the practice could relocate elsewhere in the town centre to a less sensitive locations.

In conclusion, the proposal would not preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the statutory listed building. Such harm would not be outweighed by public benefits, and the scheme would be contrary to policies DM01 and DM06 of Barnet's Development Management Policies Document (2012), policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), and to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Impact on amenities of neighbouring occupiers:

The proposed first floor side and rear extension would be sited on top of the existing single storey side and rear extension.

It is considered that the proposal would not have any detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of no.29 Wood Street on the west, because of the separation gap present by the side access road. The side window facing no.29 would overlook the side access road and considered not to have any detrimental impact on no.29 Wood Street in terms of overlooking. Furthermore, the flank wall of no.29 and 27 already feature side windows. The proposed window would not add any additional overlooking impact than what is existing.

The proposed first floor rear windows would overlook the rear parking area and considered not to have any additional detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed front dormer windows at first floor would overlook Wood Street and considered not to have any detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal would not have any detrimental impact on the amenities of attached property no.23/25, as any impact would be buffered by the existing property.

5.4 Response to Public Consultation

Addressed in the report.

6. Equality and Diversity Issues

The proposal does not conflict with either Barnet Council's Equalities Policy or the commitments set in the Equality Scheme and supports the Council in meeting its statutory equality responsibilities.

7. Conclusion

Having taken all material considerations into account, it is considered that this proposal would not comply with the Adopted Barnet Local Plan policies and guidance and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of this part of Conservation area.

No public benefit has been identified to outweigh the harm of the heritage asset and therefore having regard to the provisions of Policy DM06 of the Development Management Policies and Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 it is recommended that planning permission should be REFUSED.

