Location 67 Ridgeview Close Barnet EN5 2QD

Reference: 17/5453/HSE Received: 22nd August 2017

Accepted: 23rd August 2017

Ward: Underhill Expiry 18th October 2017

Applicant: Lavdrim Koldashi

Proposal: New front porch and boundary wall (Retrospective Application)

Recommendation: Approve subject to conditions

AND the Committee grants delegated authority to the Head of Development Management 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 development hereby permitted shall be completed and maintained in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. PL-000, 001Rev.C and Site location plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and so as to ensure that the development is carried out fully in accordance with the plans as assessed in accordance with Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policy DM01 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

Informative(s):

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, focused on solutions. The LPA has produced planning policies and written guidance to assist applicants when submitting applications. These are all available on the Council's website. A pre-application advice service is also offered. The LPA has negotiated with the applicant/agent where necessary during the application process to ensure that the proposed development is in accordance with the Development Plan.

Officer's Assessment

1. Site Description

The application site contains a two storey terraced dwellinghouse. The property is not within a conservation area, and is not listed.

2. Site History

Reference: 17/4239/PNH

Address: 67 Ridgeview Close, London, EN5 2QD Decision: Prior Approval Required and Refused

Decision Date: 10 July 2017

Description: Single storey rear extension with a proposed depth of 6 metres from original

rear wall, eaves height of 3 metres and maximum height of 3 metres.

Reference: 17/4423/PNH

Address: 67 Ridgeview Close, London, EN5 2QD

Decision: Prior Approval Not Required

Decision Date: 8 August 2017

Description: Single storey rear extension with a proposed depth of 6 metres from original

rear wall, eaves height of 3 metres and maximum height of 3 metres.

3. Proposal

This application seeks retrospective planning permission for:

- A front porch to the front elevation of the property. The front porch has a width of approximately 2 metres, a maximum depth of approximately 1.5 metres, and a maximum ridge height of approximately 3.55 metres. It would have an area of 3 square metres.
- A boundary wall with a height of 1.1 metres.

It is noted that the submitted drawings show the development to extend beyond the boundary of the applicant's ownership. However, the applicant's agent has signed Certificate B within the application form and served notice on the owner of the adjacent site. The correct notification procedure has therefore been followed in this respect.

4. Public Consultation

Consultation letters were sent to 6 neighbouring properties, no comments were received.

The application has been called to the committee meeting by Cllr Prentice for the committee to consider the impact on the neighbour's amenities.

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 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. This is a key part of the Governments 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, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people'. 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 (MALP)

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 2031. 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.

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.

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.

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guidance SPD (adopted 2016)

- The SPD states that large areas of Barnet are characterised by relatively low density suburban housing with an attractive mixture of terrace, semi-detached and detached houses. The Council is committed to protecting, and where possible enhancing the character of the borough's residential areas and retaining an attractive street scene.
- Para.14.53 of SPD states that extensions need to be carefully designed. A properly designed porch can have a positive effect on the area. In some cases depending upon the location, size, type, either large or smaller porches may be appropriate. The porch roof should reflect the roof style of the existing house. The material, shape and style of existing doors and windows should be matched to create an overall balance to the design.
- Para.14.54 of SPD states that where a porch is on the front elevation, special care should be taken that it does not spoil the appearance of the property and street as well as the outlook of neighbouring houses.

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted 2016)

- Provides detailed guidance that supplements policies in the adopted Local Plan, and sets out how sustainable development will be delivered in Barnet.

5.2 Main issues for consideration

The main issues for consideration in this case are:

- Whether harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the wider locality;
- Whether harm would be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

5.3 Assessment of proposals

Whether harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the wider locality

The front porch has a pitched roof. It extends from the main front wall by a depth of 1.5 metres, have a width of 2 metres, and have a height of 3.35 metres. The existing boundary wall has a height of 1.1 metres which extends from the elevation of the front porch.

Class D of the General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015 (GPDO) sets out the circumstances under which front porches may benefit from deemed planning permission, and therefore be permitted development. Conditions D.1(b) and (c) of state that a porch would not be permitted if the ground area of the porch would exceed 3 square metres and more than 3 metres in height above ground level. It is noted that the existing porch has a ground area of 3 square metres which complies with Condition D.1(b), but it's height does not comply with Condition D.1(c) of GPDO. On this basis, the porch does not benefit from deemed planning permission under permitted development rights, and express planning permission is therefore required.

However, it is noted that the height is only 0.55 metres above the requirement set out under Condition D.1(c). Furthermore, the front porch is considered to be compliant with Para.14.53 of the Residential Design Guidance. Taking into account the design of the proposed porch, and that it appears as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling, it is considered that the front porch by virtue of its acceptable size and design will not look alien in relation to the surrounding properties and the street scene.

The front porch addition is similar in scale to the front porch of several surrounding properties; i.e. 33 and 71 Ridgeview Close. Given that there are similar front porch extensions in the immediate street environment, the front porch and boundary wall are not considered to be out of character for this context.

It is noted that there are existing boundary walls with similar style and size on the neighbouring properties in this part of Ridgeview Close. In addition, the boundary wall on 67 Ridgeview Close has used similar materials to its adjoining dwellinghouse which is not considered to be out of character for this context. It is considered to be a proportionate and congruous addition to the main house. In this regard, the boundary wall, by its reason of its depth, height and design is considered to be an acceptable addition to the area and does not detract from the character and appearance of the host property or its vicinity.

Overall, the existing developments are considered to be a proportionate and congruous addition to the main house. It will be keeping with the appearance of the main dwelling and maintain the character of the street scene.

Whether harm would be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring residents

The front porch is considered to be compliant with Para.14.54 of Residential Design Guidance, as the proposed development will be at a sufficient distance not to impact the outlook from the neighbouring properties to an unacceptable level. In addition, the existing front porch by reason of its size and design is not anticipated to adversely impact the amenities of the occupants of any neighbouring properties.

The boundary wall is considered to be of a size and design that it would not result in unacceptable levels of harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD.

5.4 Response to Public Consultation

N/A

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 subject to compliance with the attached conditions, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the application site, the street scene and the locality. The development is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This application is therefore recommended for approval.

