LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 9 February 2016

Report of

Assistant Director, Planning, Highways & Transportation

Contact Officer: Andy Higham Sharon Davidson Ms M Demetri Ward: Southbury

Ref: 15/05311/HOU

Category: Householder

LOCATION: 78 Central Avenue, Enfield, EN1 3QG,

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side extension and a part single, part two storey rear extension.

Applicant Name & Address:

Mrs Katarena Lewis 78 Central Ave Enfield EN1 3QG **Agent Name & Address:**

Mr Amir Faizollahi 6 Bournwell Close London EN4 0JX United Kingdom

RECOMMENDATION:

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



1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 A planning application of this nature would normally be determined under delegated authority. However, the applicant occasionally works for the Building Control team within the Council's Development Management Section and in accordance with the scheme of Delegation, the application is reported to Planning Committee for consideration.
- 1.2 No.78 Central Avenue is a semi-detached dwelling house situated in an established residential area of the Southbury Ward. The semi-detached pair are situated on the corner of Central Avenue and consequently angled towards the grass verge. The site is not in a Conservation Area and it is not a Listed Building.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension and a part single, part two storey rear extension.

3.0 Relevant Planning Decisions

3.1 TP/03/2113

Part two storey, part single storey side extension

Granted subject to conditions on 15th December 2003.

4.0 Consultations

4.1 Statutory and non-statutory consultees

4.1.1 No statutory and non-statutory consultations required to take place.

4.2 Public response

4.2.1 Letters were sent to 5 adjoining and nearby residents. Consultation ended on the 4th January 2016. No response has been received.

5.0 Relevant Policy

5.1 London Plan

Policy 7.1 Building London's Neighbourhoods and communities

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.6 Architecture

5.2 <u>Core Strategy</u>

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

5.3 Development Management Document

DMD 11 Rear extension

DMD 13 Roof extensions

DMD 14 Side extension

5.4 Other Policy

NPPF NPPG

6.0 Analysis

6.1 <u>Visual amenity</u>

- 6.1.1 DMD 37 encourages achieving a high quality and design led development. The design of an extension would need to respect the character of the surrounding area but also make a positive contribution to the places identity. This policy is re-iterated by CP30 of the Core Strategy as well as the fundamental aims of the NPPF.
- 6.1.2 The two storey side extension has been set off the shared boundary by 3.8m to the front of the extension and 1.4m to the rear of the extension, it has been set back from the principle elevation by 1.6m on the ground floor and first floor and set down from the ridge of the parent dwelling house by 0.4m. As a result it is considered that it would appear as subordinate to the dwelling. It is acknowledged that the proposal is wide, however, due to the set back from the principle elevation, the set in on the side boundary and the set down from the ridge, would ensure that the extension would not relate unacceptably to the existing house. The proposed windows have been designed with a strong vertical emphasis in the front elevation.
- 6.1.3 The two storey rear extension has been designed with a hipped roof serving the main pitched roof. The extension is less than half the width of the original dwelling house and thus would not cause harm to visual amenity. It has been designed to be subordinate and allows the main dwelling house to be the principle feature.
- 6.1.4 The single storey rear extension is conventional in design and traditional in appearance. It has been designed with a pitched roof with roof lights. No objection is raised to this element of the scheme.
- 6.1.5 Overall, no objection is raised subject to a condition relating to the materials matching the existing dwelling house.

6.2 Residential amenity

6.2.1 DMD 11 seeks to protect the amenities of people living next to a proposed extension. It states that if a single storey rear extension is deeper than 3m for a semi-detached dwelling house, then any excess depth would only be acceptable if there is no breach when a 45 degree line is drawn from the midpoint of the nearest original ground floor window or a common alignment is secured. The single storey rear extension is the same depth as the existing extension serving the dwelling house, which also incidentally secures a common alignment with 80 Central Avenue. Consequently, no objection is raised to this element of the scheme.

- 6.2.2 DMD 11 also requires first floor extensions not to exceed a line taken at 30 degrees from the mid-point of the nearest original first floor window to any of the adjacent properties. There would be no breach in the 30 degree line when drawn from 80 Central Avenue and 31 Gough Road. Consequently, no objection is raised to this element of the scheme.
- 6.2.3 Due to the siting of the side extension, there would be no undue harm caused to neighbouring properties. The proposed windows on the ground floor flank elevation would be secondary windows. As they would face on to the boundary with 31 Gough Road at an angle there would be no undue harm caused to residential amenity. The first floor flank window would serve a bathroom. This window is to be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m of the finished floor level. This is subject to a condition reiterating this point.
- 6.2.4 Overall, no objection is raised subject to a condition relating to the obscure glazing to the first floor flank window, no insertion of additional fenestration and no sub division of the site to a separate unit. This is to safeguard residential amenity of existing occupiers.

6.3 <u>Highways</u>

6.3.1 As there is no net increase in the number of units on the site an assessment regarding parking is not required.

6.4 CIL

6.4.1 As of 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 2016. The development is not CIL liable.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 No objection is raised to the proposed scheme in terms of visual amenity or residential amenity. The proposal would adhere to CP30 of the Core Strategy (2010), DMD 11, DMD 14 and DMD 37 of the Development Management Document (2014) and the London Plan policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1 That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions:
- 1. C51 time limit
- 2. C61 plans (amended)
- 3. C08 materials to match
- 4. C27 No sub division of site
- 5. Flank window on first floor– obscure glazing and non-opening below 1.7m of finished floor level
- 6. No additional fenestration to the extension





