PLANNING COMMITTEE		Date: 4 th February 2015		
Report of Assistant Director, Planning, Highways & Transportation	Contact Officer: Andy Higham 020 837 Sharon Davidson 020 8 Ms A Treloar 020 8379	8379 3841	Ward: Highlands	
Ref: 14/04222/HOU		Category: Ho	Category: Householder	
PROPOSAL: Conversion of b external ground level to the ba		x bed family dwe	ellling involving lowering th	
Applicant Name & Address : Mr Kyriacos Charalambous 46 Old Park View Enfield Middlesex EN2 7EJ United Kingdom		Agent Name & Address: Mr AMIR FAIZOLLAHI Plan Drawing Service Civic Centre Silver Street Enfield London EN1 3XE		



1. Site and Surroundings

- 1.1 The subject site is located on the eastern side of Old Park View between Slades Hill and Old Park Road. It has a regular shape and is approximately 632m² in area. It has a natural slope from northeast (rear) to southwest (front) and contains a bungalow with rear garage and shed.
- 1.2 The site is located within an established residential area. The bungalow forms part of a consistent row between No. 34 and 46. The property immediately adjoining to the south (No. 54 Old Park View) and those on the opposite side of the road are predominately detached two-storey dwellings of different styles.

2. Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for alterations and additions to the existing bungalow to create a two-storey dwelling, including:
 - A first floor extension.
 - A two-storey side extension.
 - Alterations to the fenestration and the external materials.
- 2.2 The plans have been amended during the course of the application to provide a more resolved architectural design and details of the proposed excavation within the existing building to lower the finished floor level.

3. Relevant Planning Decisions

- 3.1 14/03330/HOU: Alterations and additions to the existing bungalow to provide a two-storey dwelling refused 14 October 2014 on the following grounds:
 - The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive eaves and ridge height, would fail to provide an appropriate graduation between the neighbouring dwellings and would therefore disrupt the rhythm of development in the street scene contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy 30 of the Core Strategy, and Policies 6 and 8 DMD Submission Version.
 - The proposed development, by reason of its overall design, would detract from the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy 30 of the Core Strategy, and Policies 6, 8 and 13 DMD Submission Version, and Policies (II) H12 and (II) GD3 of the UDP Saved Policies.
 - The proposed development, by virtue of the excessive level of hardstanding, would detract from the character and appearance of the property and the street scene as a result of the loss of the front garden contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy 30 of the Core Strategy, and Policy 8 DMD Submission Version.
 - The proposed development, by reason of its excessive bulk and mass, would adversely affect the amenity of No. 44 through loss of light and outlook to the adjoining side dormer contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy 4 of the Core Strategy, and Policies 6 and 8 DMD Submission Version.

3.2 The development proposed as part of this application was larger in scale and involved maintaining the existing ground floor level and therefore the extended dwelling would have stood above the height of the adjoining house at No.54 Old Park View. In addition, the previous application included the proposal to resurface the majority of the front garden. The surfacing of the front garden does not form part of the current application as the works can be carried out without the need for planning permission providing the surfacing material used is permeable or the surface drains to a permeable area.

4. Consultations

4.1 Statutory and non-statutory consultees

4.1.1 None.

4.2 Public response

- 4.2.1 Consultation letters were sent 14 adjoining and nearby occupiers. Reconsultation has taken place with all neighbours following the receipt of revised plans.
- 4.2.2 Following the original consultation 3 letters of objection were received. Following re-consultation a further two objections have been received. The objections raised to the revised scheme can be summarised as follows:
 - The proposal development would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene.
 - Loss of light.
 - Loss of privacy.
 - Concern regarding the accuracy of the plans and the level of detail provided, and how this may affect the end building, the impact on the street scene and the neighbours' amenity.
 - Concern that the existing bungalow cannot support the proposed alterations and additions, and that it may be entirely demolished and rebuilt.
 - Damage to the adjoining properties and restricted access during construction.
 - Excessive noise, pollution, dust and dirt during construction.
 - The existing bungalow should be retained; the proposed development would set an undesirable prescient for future development within the street.

5. Relevant Policies

5.1 London Plan

Policy 7.4	Local character
Policy 7.6	Architecture

5.2 Core Strategy

Policy 4	Housing quality
Policy 30	Maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open
	environment

5.3 <u>DMD Policies</u>

DMD 6	Residential character
DMD 8	General standards for new residential development
DMD 13	Roof extensions
DMD 14	Side extensions
DMD 37	Achieving high quality and design-led development
DMD 38	Design process

5.4 Other Relevant Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework National Planning Policy Guidance

6. Analysis

Principle

6.1 The adopted policies encourage the maintenance and enhancement of existing housing stock. However, proposals must also be assessed in relation to material considerations such as impact on the character of the surrounding area and impact on the neighbours' amenity.

Impact on the character of the surrounding area

Height, bulk and mass

- 6.2 DMD6 and DMD8 require residential development to be of an appropriate scale, bulk and mass having regard to the existing pattern of development and character typologies.
- 6.3 The applicant has provided a street scene drawing to show that the eaves of the extended dwelling would match those at No. 54 adjoining and that the ridge would provide an appropriate graduation in height between the adjoining buildings. The finished floor level of the dwelling is to be lowered, taking advantage of void space that presently exists beneath the existing floor. This enables the additional accommodation to be achieved at first floor level, whilst respecting the eaves and ridge height of the adjoining dwelling.
- 6.4 It is considered that first floor addition with hip roof and the two-storey side extension with mono-pitch roof would provide an appropriate design response with regards to scale, bulk and mass and sit comfortably within the established street scene.

Terracing effect

- 6.5 DMD14 requires that side extensions to residential properties maintain a 1m distance from the adjoining property at first floor level so not to create a continuous façade or terracing effect.
- 6.6 The two-storey side extension would comply with this policy and maintain a 1m distance from No. 44.

Design

- 6.7 The plans have been amended during the course of the application to provide a more resolved architectural design.
- 6.8 The amended plans show that the profile of the roof and the eaves and ridge heights would be in keeping with the adjoining buildings. The two-storey side extension would be setback from the front wall of the existing building to present a recessed, subservient addition. The external materials including plain roof tiles, brickwork on the ground floor and render on the first floor would reference the adjoining building at No. 54. The style and proportion of the doors and windows would be appropriate to the building.

Impact to neighbours

6.9 The proposed alterations and additions would not increase the depth of the existing building. They would increase the height and the width (towards No. 44).

Overshadowing

6.10 The proposed alterations and additions would not adversely affect the neighbours' amenity through loss of light having regard to the orientation of the plots, the shadow cast by the existing buildings, and the proposed bulk and mass.

Light and outlook

- 6.11 No. 54 has a ground floor obscure glazed laundry window and a first floor obscure glazed bathroom window on the flank elevation opposite the site. The first floor extension would not unreasonably affect the light or outlook to/from these obscure glazed non-habitable room windows.
- 6.12 No. 44 has a side dormer setback 2.8m from the common boundary which is the only source of light and outlook to Bedroom 1. The two-storey side extension would maintain a 1m distance from the common boundary and have a mono-pitch roof so as not to unreasonably affect the light or outlook to/from this side dormer.

Privacy

6.13 The proposed alterations and additions would not include any first floor habitable room windows on the flank elevations. It is noted that the first floor extension would include a bathroom window on the southeast elevation (opposite No. 54). However, this is not a habitable room and a condition is recommended to ensure that it is obscure glazed.

Other Issues raised

Plans

6.14 The objectors have raised concern regarding the accuracy of the plans and the level of detail provided. There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the plans submitted.

Structural integrity of the existing building

6.16 The objectors have raised concern regarding the structural integrity of the existing bungalow and whether the proposed alterations and additions could be constructed without completely demolishing the existing building. However, the submitted plans confirm that the existing four external walls are to be retained, extending them upwards to achieve the necessary height. The applicant advises that the scheme has been designed to ensure compliance with the Building Regulations to ensure the resultant structure is sound.

Construction management issues

6.17 The objectors have raised concerns regarding damage to the adjoining properties and restricted access during construction, as well as excessive noise, pollution, dust and dirt during construction. The impact of construction activities on neighbouring properties are recognised. However, this is a domestic extension. The impacts of additional noise, dust and dirt are temporary in nature and are not grounds for refusing planning permission. The structural impacts of construction works on neighbouring properties are a matter to be dealt with at Building Regulations stage and/or under Party Wall Legislation.

Loss of the existing bungalow

6.18 The objectors have also raised concern regarding the loss of the existing bungalow. The existing property is not protected through listed building or conservation area designation. The character of the immediate area is mixed, comprising both bungalows and two storey houses. Indeed the immediately adjoining property at No.54 comprises a two storey house. Accordingly, it is considered that the extension of the property as proposed will not undermine the character of the area.

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 6.19 As of April 2010, legislation in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) came into force which 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 2015.
- 6.20 The proposed alterations and additions would increase the floor area of the existing bungalow by approximately $131.5m^2$ (existing $89.5m^2$; proposed $221m^2$). The CIL calculation based on the current index figure is therefore (£20 x $131.5m^2$ x 237)/223 = £2,795.11.

7. Conclusion

7.1 In conclusion, the proposed alterations and additions would provide an appropriate design response and make a positive contribution to the street scene in accordance with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies 4 and 30 of the Core Strategy, and Policies 6, 8, 13 and 14 of the Development

Management Document. They would not adversely affect the neighbours' amenity through loss of light, outlook or privacy in accordance with Policies 8, 13 and 14 of the Development Management Document.

8 Recommendation

- 8.1 That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:
 - 1. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, including any plans that may have been revised, as set out in the attached schedule which forms part of this notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. Materials to Match

The external finishing materials shall match those used in the construction of the existing building and/or areas of hard surfacing.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance.

3 No Additional Fenestration

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any amending Order, no external windows or doors other than those shown on the approved drawings shall be installed without prior approval from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of adjoining properties.

4 Obscure glazing

The glazing serving first floor bathroom of the development indicated on drawing No 003 rev D shall be fixed shut to a height of 1.7m above the floor level of the bathroom and in obscured glass with an equivalent obscuration as level 3 on the Pilkington Obscuration Range. The glazing shall not be altered without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of adjoining and neighbouring properties.

5. Time Limited Permission

The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the decision notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of S.51 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.









