

Location **63 The Reddings London NW7 4JN**

Reference: **17/7512/HSE** Received: 27th November 2017
Accepted: 11th December 2017

Ward: Mill Hill Expiry 5th February 2018

Applicant: Mrs Nicole Yadid

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension

Recommendation: Refuse

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 proposed extensions by reason of their bulk, size and scale result in an incongruous form of development which would fail to appear subordinate, proportionate or sympathetic to the original dwelling house, to the detriment to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. In this regard, the proposal is considered unacceptable and fails to comply with policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD, Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy and the Barnet Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (April 2013).

Informative(s):

- 1 In accordance with paragraphs 186-187, 188-195 and 196-198 of the NPPF, the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, focused on solutions. To assist applicants in submitting development proposals, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has produced planning policies and written guidance to guide applicants when submitting applications. These are all available on the Council's website. A pre-application advice service is also offered.

The applicant did not seek to engage with the LPA prior to the submission of this application through the established formal pre-application advice service. In

accordance with paragraph 189 of the NPPF, the applicant is encouraged to utilise this service prior to the submission of any future formal planning applications, in order to engage pro-actively with the LPA to discuss possible solutions to the reasons for refusal.

2 The plans accompanying this application are:

The site location plan and the drawings entitled 1475/1A, 1475/2A, 1475/3C, 1475/4C.

Officer's Assessment

1. Site Description

This site is occupied by a two-storey detached property, and is located at the end of the cul-de-sac on the west side of The Reddings in Mill Hill ward. The area is predominantly residential and characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached properties subject to alteration by way of rear extension. The site is not within a conservation area and does not contain any listed buildings.

The host dwelling is noted to already benefit from a part single, part two storey side and rear extension together with a loft conversion incorporating side and rear dormer windows. As a result, although splayed away, the host dwelling extends beyond the rear building line of its neighbour to the east at no.61 and has a comparable size. The neighbour to the west at no.65 is a semi-detached property, also noted to be extended to the rear. Properties along this part of the Reddings are set at a ground level such that they step up in relation to each other, with the host site sitting higher than no.61 and lower than no.65.

An application for a single-storey side and rear extension to the host dwelling was refused in November 2017 (17/5837/HSE), and the present application differs only in respect of reduced depth of the rearward projection, 3.5 metres instead of 4 metres. This change is not considered to overcome the previous reason for refusal, being the failure to appear subordinate, proportionate or sympathetic to the existing dwelling house, to the detriment to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

2. Site History

Reference: 17/5837/HSE

Address: 63 The Reddings, London, NW7 4JN

Decision: Refused

Decision Date: 21 November 2017

Description: Single storey side and rear extension

Reason: The proposed extensions by reason of their bulk, size and scale result in an incongruous form of development which would fail to appear subordinate, proportionate or sympathetic to the existing dwelling house, to the detriment to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. In this regard, the proposal is considered unacceptable and fails to comply with policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD, Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Barnet Core Strategy and the Barnet Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (April 2013).

Reference: TPP/0506/17

Address: 63 The Reddings, London, NW7 4JN

Decision: Trees: Approved subject to Conditions

Decision Date: 11 September 2017

Description: 1 x Oak (applicant's ref. T3) - Lift to 3m, Reduce longest lateral branch growing towards the house at 63 The Reddings and the longest lateral branch growing over the garden of 61 The Reddings by no more than 2m, remove dead wood/defects and balance the crown - with no more than 30% of the total leaf-bearing branch structure being removed as part of these combined treatments. Standing in Group G3 of Tree Preservation Order

Reference: 17/5676/PNH

Address: 63 The Reddings, London, NW7 4JN

Decision: Prior Approval Required and Refused

Decision Date: 8 September 2017

Description: Single storey rear extension with a proposed depth of 8 metres from original rear wall, eaves height of 3 metres and maximum height of 3 metres

Reference: H/01710/08

Address: 63 The Reddings, London, NW7 4JN

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 18 August 2008

Description: Part single, part two storey side and rear extension together with a loft conversion incorporating side and rear dormer windows.

3. Proposal

The application seeks permission to erect a single storey side and rear extension. The proposal would adjoin an existing two-storey rear extension and single-storey side extension.

The proposed addition to the rear would project a depth of 3.5 metres; measure 9 metres in width and with a flat roof with a maximum height of 3 metres.

The proposed side extension would project 1.6 metres in width from the side elevation, an addition of 0.2 metres to the width of the existing side projection. The depth of the side extension would be 3.5 metres, uniform with the rear projection. The side projection would be set away from the common boundary with no.183 by 1.3 metres at its closets point.

4. Consultation

4.1 Public consultation

Consultation letters were sent to 5 neighbouring properties.

1 representations was received within the statutory consultation period.

The representation can be summarised as follows:-

- Soil excavated for the extension must be removed
- Trees should be planted at the back of garden for neighbour privacy

4.2 Committee call-in

Councillor John Hart called the item in to Committee. The stated planning reason for call-in given is that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the property and the streetscene.

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

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 2050. 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 October 2016)

- Sets out information for applicants to help them design an extension to their property which would receive favourable consideration by the Local Planning Authority and was the subject of separate public consultation. 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.

- States that extensions should normally be subordinate to the original house, respect the original building and should not be overly dominant. Extensions should normally be consistent in regard to the form, scale and architectural style of the original building which can be achieved through respecting the proportions of the existing house and using an appropriate roof form.
- In respect of amenity, states that extensions should not be overbearing or unduly obtrusive and care should be taken to ensure that they do not result in harmful loss of outlook, appear overbearing, or cause an increased sense of enclosure to adjoining properties. They should not reduce light to neighbouring windows to habitable rooms or cause significant overshadowing, and should not look out of place, overbearing or intrusive when viewed from surrounding areas.

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (adopted October 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.

Impact to the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the wider locality

Any scheme for this site will need to respect the character and appearance of the local area, relate appropriately to the sites context and comply with development plan policies in these respects. This will include suitably addressing the requirements of the development plan policies including DM01, and CS05 of the Barnet Local Plan (2012) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016).

The host dwelling already benefits from a two-storey rear extension and single-storey side extension, with consent granted under H/01710/08 dated 23.06.2008. These works were noted to have been carried out at site visit. It is noted that the in-situ two-storey extension projects to a depth 3.6 metres from the original rear wall. The side extension projects a total depth of 7.55 metres with a width of 3.05 metres from the original side wall.

The proposed side and rear extension would therefore adjoin this existing two-storey rear extension and single-storey side extension. The proposed addition to the rear would project a depth of 3.5 metres, measure 9 metres in width and with a flat roof with a maximum height of 3 metres.

The proposed side extension would project 1.6 metres in width from the side elevation, an addition of 0.2 metres width from the existing. The depth of the side extension would be 3.5 metres, uniform with the rear projection.

At paragraph 14.3, the adopted Residential Design Guide SPD (2016) states that "there is a limit to how much most houses can be extended. The cumulative effect of extensions and their impact on the appearance of an area should also be taken into account. This means that proposed additions, which meet all the guidelines included in this SPD, may still be considered unacceptable and be refused planning permission."

At paragraph 14.8, the SPD clarifies that it is the original building which is of concern when assessing extensions to dwellinghouses. It states that "proposed extensions should be consistent with the form, scale and architectural style of the original building, particularly where it is a period or suburban property." In terms of scale, the guidance reiterates that "the extension should normally be subordinate to the original house" and that "the extension should respect the original building and should not be overly-dominant." It is not considered that, when taken together with the previous extensions, the proposal would not accord with the original form and scale of the host dwelling and the total enlargement would not comprise a subordinate extension.

The adopted SPD (2016) states that a rear extension is usually acceptable at a depth of 4 metres for a detached property. In this case, the property has previously been extended and the addition would amount to a total projection of 7.1 metres from the original rear wall. This is near double the acceptable depth of the SPD guidance and adds considerably to the bulk and scale of the original dwellinghouse. It is noted that the original dwellinghouse had a depth of approximately 8.8 metres and as such the proposal would nearly double the original depth of the dwellinghouse, such that it is not considered to be proportionate to its original scale and form. When viewed from the surrounding garden area, the proposed projection to a depth of 4 metres from the extended wall and a height of 3 metres would appear as a bulky and prominent addition. Therefore it is considered that the cumulative effect of extensions to the host dwelling with the proposed would amount to detriment to the character and appearance of the original house.

To the north of the host site, no.65 The Reddings benefits from a consented single-storey rear extension to a maximum depth of 3.5 metres, (W16074A/07 dated 28/11/2007). A canopy was noted adjoining the extension at no.65, however this does not benefit from planning permission and has been reported to Enforcement. This depth of the canopy does not form a material consideration for this application. To the south, no.61 benefits from a consented single-storey rear extension projecting an approximate depth of 2.5 metres (W10616B/00 dated 12.01.2001). The application Planning Statement raises these as material considerations to the application however it is noted that these were already assessed within the previous application and subsequent decision to refuse. As with the previous report, the extensions are noted to benefit from planning consent and comprise proportionate additions which comply with the local development plan policy and respect the scale, form and proportions of the original dwellinghouse concerned, whereas the present proposal seeks to extend from the in-situ extension to a depth that is beyond the depth considered acceptable in the adopted SPD.

Also raised is the rear extension 3 Abbey View, London, NW7 4PB under ref. 16/5281/HSE. It is noted that this property is not located in the same street as the host dwelling, and in fact sits in a different context of area character and appearance, noting the substantially larger dwellings and plots as well as significant screening provided by trees. Whilst there may be instances where larger extensions are acceptable, it is considered that on balance the proposed addition to the host site would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original building and its surrounding context.

For the reasons discussed above, the proposal is considered to be at odds with the objectives of the relevant planning policy DM01, failing to relate appropriately to the sites context and to respect the character of the area. In addition the proposal is considered to be contrary to the guidance contained in the adopted SPD, the Residential Design Guide (2016) in terms of depth of the rear extension.

Impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents

Any scheme for this site should address the relevant development plan policies (for example policy DM01 of the Barnet Local Plan and policy 7.6 of the London Plan) in respect of the protection of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This will include taking a full account of all neighbouring sites.

It is not considered that the proposal would lead to harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. This is as a result of the siting of the host property, noting that it is a detached property set away from neighbouring sites. The host property is both set back from and angled away from the property at no.65, which also sits at a higher ground level to the host. The relationship to no.61 is such that the proposal would not be considered to give rise to a detrimental impact on amenity, being set away from the flank wall by approximately 3 metres towards the back of the two properties.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy DM01 in this respect.

5.4 Response to Public Consultation

The public consultation response comprised one letter or representation. This raised the following points:-

- Soil excavated for the extension must be removed

Matters relating to the construction period are not a planning consideration.

-Trees should be planted at the back of garden for neighbour privacy

In context of the nature and scale of this proposal, this does not constitute a material planning consideration.

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 the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the application site, the street scene and the locality. This application is therefore recommended for refusal.

8. Without prejudice -- Conditions in the event that an appeal will be allowed

1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

The site location plan and the drawings entitled 1475/1A, 1475/2A, 1475/3C, 1475/4C.

Other plans accompanying this application: Planning Statement.

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).

2. This development must be begun within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3. The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the building(s) shall match those used in the existing building(s).

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the building and surrounding area in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012).

4. The roof of the extension hereby permitted shall only be used in connection with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area.

Reason: To ensure that the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties are not prejudiced by overlooking in accordance with policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

SITE PLAN

SCALE 1:1250

63 The Reddings,

London NW7 4JN

