

# Planning Appeal- Statement Of Common Ground

## Description:

Demolition of garage and erection of detached House

## Site:

Land Opposite 15 Sunset View, Barnet  
EN5 4LB

## Applicant:

Christchurchgrove Ltd

## Author:

Stuart Lees and Stuart Robinson

March 2026

---

## Alan Cox Architects

224a High Street, Barnet, EN5 5SZ

☎ 0208 440 7777

[stuart@coxassociates.co.uk](mailto:stuart@coxassociates.co.uk)

VAT Reg. No 931 8426 21 / Registered

No: 6563552.



## **Matters that are agreed**

Appeal Site area; 3885m<sup>2</sup> total site. Extent of House & Garden; 985m<sup>2</sup>

There is a housing crisis and there is a need to increase housing supply and to optimise capacity through the development of sites within settlements and sustainable locations. (NPPF, London Plan, Barnet Local Plan)

There is also a requirement to provide choice of house types and to make small sites available to SME builders (NPPF & London Plan)

Residential use is consistent with the general character of the area (DL – Delegated Report)

Residential forms approximately a quarter of the Conservation Area (Monken Hadley Conservation Area Character Appraisal)

There are no definitive historical records but the maps suggest these two plots were nurseries which then became part of extended gardens to houses in Hadley Grove (LPA 2<sup>nd</sup> pre-app; Green Environmental Report)

The tree and foliage screen on the western boundary of the site (as designated in the Magic Map as Priority Woodland) makes a contribution to the appearance of this part of the Conservation Area providing a green terminal feature to the view eastwards along Sunset View (LPA 2<sup>nd</sup> pre-app)

The proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset (ie the view of the western boundary of the site along Sunset View the Conservation Area) (DR)

There are no other detrimental impacts of any significance in relation to statutory listed and locally listed heritage assets due to the orientation and distances away from the appeal site (2<sup>nd</sup> Pre-App, DR)

There are no alternative plans to manage the woodland formed by the appeal site (2<sup>nd</sup> Pre-App, DR, Public Comments)

There are no concerns in relation to loss of amenity to local residents given the siting of the proposed dwelling and its context. (DR).

The dwelling provides a reasonably good level of accommodation, in accordance with the LPA's standards for future occupiers (DR)

The provision for cycles, car parking, waste and recycling is considered acceptable and in accordance with LPA's standards. (DR)

The Planning Conditions to be imposed as suggested by LBB should the appeal allowed are considered acceptable by the appellant.

### **Matters that are not agreed**

The key area of disagreement is whether the proposal will have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the application site. This is based on whether the proposals will alter the view of the site's western boundary, adjacent to Christ Church Lane when viewed from eastwards along Sunset View. The Appellants view is that there will be no material change and their proposals for a funded management plan will conserve that view.

The provision of a single house is a public benefit (in relation to outweighing any perceived harm to the Conservation Area) particularly given the importance planning policy attributes to providing housing supply on a site withing a sustainable location and, in addition, if it would be suitable for a SME builder. (DR)

The appeal site is in a sustainable location due to the proximity of the Town Centre and public transport services (both bus and tube) all well within walking distance. PTAL rating is not a reliable indicator in this regard. (DR)

The footprint, size and mass of the proposed dwelling is too large (DR) See contrary evidence in Statement of Case.

The entire appeal site should be classified as Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland (DR and 2<sup>nd</sup> Pre-app) notwithstanding the difference in quality tress and foliage on the eastern half of the site and failure to meet required criteria as surveyed by two expert ecologists for the Appellants.

LPA state that a Woodland Tree Order has been made (26/TPO/001). However the landowners objected to this within prescribed period an have been notified that the Order is due to be considered by LBB's Planning committee in July 2026.

Unlikely presence of bats and other mammals, as well as protected and notable species on site.(DR). No verifiable evidence .

Appellants arboricultural specialist disputes the presence of any veteran trees on site. (DR) Those cited in the DR have recently been added onto the ATI, an open source document, do not meet the qualifying measurements on the Lonsdale measurement criteria. (see Appeal SoC Appendix 4)

LPA do not acknowledge abundance of Cherry Laurel on site (although they say that they “have not omitted it” (sic)) and the detrimental impact this has, and will continue to have on ecology, wildlife, soil quality and biodiversity. (see SoC and Appendix Despite the denial in the DR there is no evidence that this invasive species has been observed or its impact considered.

LPA do not acknowledge that, despite the importance that they attribute to the environmental and conservation value of the site, particularly the western boundary, the site requires a funded landscape management scheme as prescribed by the suggested planning condition no 4 in the DR.