

# LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date : 24<sup>th</sup> September 2013

**Report of**

Assistant Director - Planning,  
Highways & Transportation

**Contact Officer:**

Andy Higham Tel: 020 8379 3848  
Sharon Davidson Tel: 020 8379 3841  
Mrs J. Rebaire Tel: 020 8379 3822

**Ward:** Southgate

**Application Number :** P13-02165PLA

**Category:** Householder  
Developments

**LOCATION:** 28, GREENWAY, LONDON, N14 6NN

**PROPOSAL:** Part single, part two storey rear extension.

**Applicant Name & Address:**

Mehul Gandhi  
28, GREENWAY,  
LONDON,  
N14 6NN

**Agent Name & Address:**

Ben Morris,  
Rosser Morris Ltd.  
The White House  
Hockliffe Street  
Leighton Buzzard  
Bedfordshire  
LU7 1HD

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

## **1. Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1 The property is a two storey detached residential dwelling situated on the north side of Greenway, falling within Meadway Conservation Area. The property has an existing garage to the side and single storey extension to the rear. The area is made up largely of 2-storey residential dwellings. The adjoining properties No. 26, to the east is attached to No. 28, by original garages to both properties; No. 30, a semi detached dwelling, is to the west .
- 1.2 The rear garden areas fall away from the properties towards allotments to the rear.
- 1.3 The property lies within Meadway Conservation Area and is referred to as a building which contributes to the special interest of the area.

## **2. Proposal**

- 2.1 This is a revised application following the grant of planning permission for the erection of single storey and first floor rear extensions, replacement hardstanding to front, new garage door to front elevation and new patio to rear in June 2013. The proposed amendments include an increase in depth of the single storey rear extension and the addition of a first floor rear extension on the boundary with No. 30, Greenway.
- 2.2 The proposed single storey rear extension has a depth of 3 metres closest to the boundary with No. 30. The extension then steps out after a width of 1.5 metres, by a further 1 meter, linking into the existing rear extension. The extension would have a hipped roof with a flat top crown to a height of 3.5 metres.
- 2.3 The first floor rear extension has a depth of 2 metres continuing the eastern side flank elevation of the building, for a width of 4.13 metres, then reducing in depth by 900mm for the remaining width of the property, giving a depth of 1.13 metres closest to the boundary with No. 30. The ground and first floor extension would be set 1.5 metres off the boundary with No.30.
- 2.4 The new hardstanding involves the resurfacing the existing hardstanding with flag stone paving.
- 2.5 The proposed garage door is in style to match the existing with one row of high level obscured glazed panels.
- 2.6 The existing raised patio is to remain and a new patio at ground level is proposed.

## **3. Relevant Planning Decisions**

- 3.1 P12-03173PLA – Part single storey, part 2-storey side and rear extension and new hardstanding – Withdrawn
- 3.2 P13-00290PLA - Part single storey, part 2-storey side and rear extension and new hardstanding – This application was considered at Planning Committee on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2013 when planning permission was granted.

## **4. Consultations**

### **4.1 Statutory and non-statutory consultees**

- 4.1.1 Conservation Officer

The proposed scheme is very similar to that granted planning permission in June 2013, but with an increase in the first and ground floor rear extensions. The ground floor extension will not be appreciable from the public realm and will not have an impact on the appearance of the Conservation Area.

The first floor extension on the side with No. 30, 1.13 metres in depth, is not disproportionate in terms of mass of the building. The change in form of the roof to accommodate the varied depth is slightly awkward, in particular the roof over the smaller first floor element. However, the Conservation Officer does not think this will have an impact on the street scene and it is not highly visible when viewed from the rear. Thus it is considered that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the building or Conservation Area.

#### 4.1.2 Conservation Advisory Group

Any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

## 4.2 **Public**

4.2.1 Consultation letters have been sent to 8 neighbouring properties, on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2013. In addition, a site notice was displayed at the site and published in the Enfield Independent. Two letters of objection were received raising the following points :-

- Fourth application in the last year
- Last application passed by committee despite multiple objections
- No mention in application that permission for an extension has already been granted
- Not in agreement within planning committee that rear of properties is irrelevant and unmentioned in the MECA, that proposal did not impact on amenities of near neighbours
- Extension prejudice the amenities of adjoining properties
- Drawings lack detail showing proposed extension in relation to No. 30 & roof lines.
- Disagree that proposed roofs reflect original
- Setting a dangerous precedent
- Disagree with the interpretation of the MCCA decided by planning committee
- Very little design guidance provided by the Planning Department to ensure a high quality design
- Harmony of mirrored composition is destroyed by proposed extension
- Objections raised with applicants not taken into consideration
- Rear of properties highly visible from allotments to rear and as important in Conservation terms
- Extension reduces views between 28 and 26 by about 25%
- Design does not reflect original form and character of dwelling
- Rear extension will be mishmash of strange additions to roofspace
- Proposed not shown in context with adjoining properties, not possible to determine the effect will have
- No roof plan, difficult to understand impact on roofscape which is an important feature of design of the original house
- Proposed destroys any remnant of existing property design from rear
- Bulk & design of first floor is unsympathetic, detract from symmetry of the rear elevation accentuated by the fall of rear gardens
- Proposal set dangerous precedent for future proposals
- Proposal in no way enhances or preserves the Conservation Area, a prerequisite for any development

4.2.2 In addition letters of objection were also received from the Meadway Focus Group and Fox Lane & District Residents Association raising the following points of concern:

- Fully endorse & support objections submitted so far from neighbouring properties & MFG
- Proposal will have an undeniable affect upon neighbouring properties
- Dangers of setting a precedent on applications in a CA
- Extension does prejudice amenities by adjoining residential properties
- Proposed does not reflect the roofline of original building
- Proposed first floor is disproportionate in terms of existing depth of the house & increase is highly significant, excessive and disproportionate
- Proposed neither preserves or enhances the character of the CA

## 5. Relevant Policy

5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in March 2012 allowed local planning authorities a 12 month transition period to prepare for the full implementation of the NPPF. Within this 12 month period local planning authorities could give full weight to the saved UDP policies and the Core Strategy, which was adopted prior to the NPPF. The 12 month period has elapsed and as from 28<sup>th</sup> March 2013 the Council's saved UDP and Core Strategy policies will be given due weight in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

5.2 The Development Management Document (DMD) policies have been prepared under the NPPF regime to be NPPF compliant. The Submission version DMD was approved by Council on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2013 for submission to the Secretary of State for examination. Examination and subsequent adoption is expected later this year. The DMD provides detailed criteria and standard based policies by which planning applications will be determined.

5.3 The policies listed below are considered to be consistent with the NPPF and therefore it is considered that due weight should be given to them in assessing the development the subject of this application.

### 5.4 The London Plan

Policy\_7.4 Local Character  
Policy 7.6 Architecture  
Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets & Archaeology

### 5.5 Core Strategy

CP30 Maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open environment  
CP31 Heritage

### 5.6 Saved UDP

(II) GD3 High standard of functional and aesthetic design  
(II) H12 Rear extensions  
(II) H8 Privacy  
(II) C30 Conservation Areas

### 5.7 Submission version DMD

DMD 11 Rear extensions

## 5.8 Other Relevant Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Meadway Conservation Area Character Appraisal

## 6. **Analysis**

### 6.1 Principle

6.1.1 The principle of the development has already been agreed by way of the previous application, Ref: P13-00290PLA.. The proposed application is for a very similar scheme but includes an increase in depth of part of the ground floor rear extension and the introduction of a further first floor rear extension on the side of the property nearest No.30. There are two main issues to consider which will determine acceptability. These are the impact of the additional extensions on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the impact on the residential amenities of the two immediate adjoining neighbours; Nos. 26 and 30, Greenway.

### 6.2 Impact on the character and appearance of the Meadway Conservation Area

6.2.1 The property lies within Meadway Conservation Area. Within the associated character appraisal, the property is identified as a building which contributes to the special interest of the area. The main issue of consideration is therefore whether the proposed extensions would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the property and Conservation Area. Policy (II) C30 of the Unitary Development Plan aims to ensure that all new buildings, extensions, and alterations to existing buildings within conservation areas shall replicate, reflect, or compliment the traditional characteristics of the area in terms of their design, materials and detailing.

6.2.2 The proposed part single storey, part two storey rear extension would be visible from the rear, made more prominent due to the gardens sloping downwards towards the allotments. In assessing the significance of the conservation area and these houses, it is the street frontages with their front gardens and the views down the streets that are important and display good examples of the Arts and Crafts style. Whilst it is important to monitor the changes to the rear they would generally be less interesting than the frontages and collectively more likely subject to change.

6.2.3 It has already been accepted that a single storey and first floor rear extension would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and would not result in the closing of important gaps between the dwellings, which it is recognised contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The modest increase in depth of part of the single storey rear extension would have no further material impact on the character or appearance of this Conservation Area. The additional first floor extension is also considered acceptable. Whilst the staggered rear elevation does result in a slightly awkward roof design for the new element of the extension, this extension is small in scale, would not be discernable from the street scene and would not be dominant from any public views to the rear of the site, nor would the extension close the gap between the dwellings. Accordingly, it is considered that extensions as proposed will be in keeping and character with the existing dwelling having regard to Policy (II) C30 of the Unitary Development Plan, Local Plan Policy CP30 and Development Management Plan Policies DMD 37 and DMD44.

6.2.4 The proposed flag stone hard standing to the front of the property and the alterations to the garage door remain as per the original approval and have therefore been held to be acceptable and would preserve the character and appearance of the property within the Meadway Conservation Area having regard to Policy (II)C30 of the Unitary Development Plan, and Local Plan Policy CP31 and , Development Management Document DMD44.

### 6.3 Impact on residential amenity

6.3.1 The proposed single storey rear extension has a depth of 3 metres on the boundary with No. 30, as per the earlier approval. The extension would then project a further 1 metre, to align with the rear wall of an existing single storey rear extension. At the point that the proposed extension projects a further 1m in depth, the extension would be inset approximately 2.6 metres from the application boundary with No.30. Given this distance from the boundary, it is considered that this increase in depth will not have any undue adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of No.30 in terms of loss of light or outlook, having regards to Policy (II) H12 of the Unitary Development Plan and (Submission) Development Management Document Policy DMD11.

6.3.2 The existing single storey rear extension on the boundary with No. 26, will be retained and as such the proposed single storey rear extension, which is just fractionally higher, will not project beyond that existing extension and would not have any impact on the amenities of No. 26, having regard to Policy (II) H12 of the Unitary Development Plan and Submission version Development Management Document Policy DMD11.

6.3.3 Permission has already been granted for the erection of a first floor rear extension 2m in depth closest to the boundary with No.26. This application continues to propose an extension of this depth and therefore there is no further impact on the amenities of the occupiers of this property. The application introduces a further first floor extension to the rear but on the side of the property nearest to No.30. This new element of extension would project 1.13m in depth from the original rear wall. Given this limited depth, it would not breach a 30' line taken from the mid point of the nearest window in No.30 and therefore would not result in any undue loss of light or outlook for the occupiers. The extension therefore would be compliant with Policy (II) H12 of the Unitary Development plan and Submission version Development Management Document Policy DMD11.

6.3.4 The proposed new patio area remains as per the earlier approval and will not result in an unacceptable level of overlooking having regards to Policy (II) H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

### 6.4 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

6.4.1 As of the April 2010, new legislation in the form of CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) came into force which would allow 'charging authorities' in England and Wales to apportion a levy on net additional floorspace for certain types of qualifying development to enable the funding of a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development. Since April 2012 the Mayor of London has been charging CIL in Enfield at the rate of £20 per sqm. The Council is progressing its own CIL but this is not expected to be introduced until spring / summer 2014.

6.4.2 The development in this instance is not CIL Liable

## **7. Conclusion**

7.1 The proposed extensions are considered to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not adversely impact on the residential amenities of the two adjoining neighbours. Accordingly it is considered that planning permission should be granted for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development due to its design, size and siting, is not considered to adversely impact on the character and appearance of this part of Meadway Conservation Area having regard to Policies (II) GD3 and (II) C30 of the Unitary Development Plan, Local Plan Policies CP30 and CP31, Submission version Development Management Document Policies DMD11, DMD37 and DMD44, Policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan as well as having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Meadway Conservation Area Character Appraisal.
2. The proposed extensions due to their design, size, siting and height would not unduly impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the two immediate adjoining properties in terms of a loss of light, outlook or privacy and in this respect complies with Policies (II) GD3, (II) H12 and (II) H8 of the Unitary Development Plan, Local Plan Policy CP30, Submission version Development Management Document Policy DMD11, Policy 7.4 of the London Plan, as well as having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The replacement hardstanding does not detract from the from the character and appearance of the street scene or Conservation Area having regard to Policy (II) GD3, Local Plan Policy CP31, Submission versio Development Management Document DMD44, and the Meadway Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

## **8. Recommendation**

8.1 That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

1. C60 Approved Drawings
2. C08 Materials to match
4. C25 No additional fenestration
5. C26 Restriction on extension roofs
6. Details regarding appropriate surfacing materials as well as satisfactory drainage provision for the driveway area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to being installed.

Reason: In the interest of visual appearance having regard to the site's location in the Conservation Area as well as in the interests of sustainability.

7. C51A Time Limit