

Location **18 Birkbeck Road London NW7 4AA**

Reference: **17/5114/HSE** Received: 7th August 2017
Accepted: 10th August 2017

Ward: Mill Hill Expiry 5th October 2017

Applicant: Mr M Hirst

Proposal: Two storey rear extension. Roof extension involving enlargement of rear dormer window with juliette balcony. Alterations to front gable window. Changes to fenestration. (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)

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 carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

6201-PL-101
6201-PL-102 A
6201-PL-103
6201-PL-104
6201-PL-106 B
6201-PL-107 A
6201-PL-108 A
6201-PL-109-A

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 Notwithstanding the provisions of any development order made under Section 59 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no windows or doors, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be placed at any time in the side elevation(s), of the extension(s) hereby approved, facing No. 14/16 and 20 Birkbeck Road.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

- 5 a) The site shall not be brought into use or first occupied until details of the means of enclosure, including boundary treatments, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved as part of this condition before first occupation or the use is commenced and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the appearance of the locality and/or the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties and to confine access to the permitted points in the interest of the flow of traffic and conditions of general safety on the adjoining highway in accordance with Policies DM01, DM03, DM17 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012), and Policies CS NPPF and CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012).

- 6 No construction work resulting from the planning permission shall be carried out on the premises at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, before 8.00 am or after 1.00 pm on Saturdays, or before 8.00 am or after 6.00pm pm on other days.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with policy DM04 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

- 7 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).

- 8 Before the building hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the side elevation facing No.14/16 Birkbeck Road shall be glazed with obscure glass only

and shall be permanently retained as such thereafter and shall be permanently fixed shut with only a fanlight opening.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy and amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DM01 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012) and the Residential Design Guidance SPD (adopted April 2013).

Informative(s):

- 1 In accordance with paragraphs 186-187, 188-195 and 196-198 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 site property is a two-storey detached single family dwellinghouse located to the west of Birkbeck Road; a residential road which lies within the ward of Mill Hill. The host dwelling previously existed as no.2 self-contained flats granted under a Lawful Development Certificate of Existing Use. However, the property was granted to convert back into a single family dwelling which also permitted the enlargement of the existing rear dormer and a single storey rear extension under a Lawful Development Certificate, ref. 17/2841/192 in June 2017.

The surrounding street scene benefits from a varied characteristic of terraced properties, semi-detached and detached properties. The area is predominantly residential in character with flats and single family dwellinghouses located along the streetscene.

The property is not listed and does not fall within a designated conservation area.

2. Site History

Reference: 15/02994/HSE

Address: 18 Birkbeck Road, London, NW7 4AA

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 29 July 2015

Description: Single storey rear extension including a rooflight.

Reference: 17/2841/192

Address: 18 Birkbeck Road, London, NW7 4AA

Decision: Lawful

Decision Date: 10 July 2017

Description: Conversion of existing 2 self-contained flats back into a single dwelling house involving enlargement of existing rear dormer and single storey rear extension. Internal alterations

3. Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a two-storey rear extension; a roof extension involving enlargement of rear dormer window; alterations to front gable window and alterations to the fenestration.

At ground floor level, the rear extension would have a depth of 4 metres x a width of 5.3 metres and a maximum height of 3.2 metres. This part of the proposal would benefit from a flat roof.

At first floor level, the rear extension would measure a depth of 2.6 metres x a width of 5.3 metres. The eaves height would be 5.5 metres with a maximum roof height of 7 metres. The roof to the rear extension would be set down 1.7 metres from the main roof.

The rear dormer window would measure a width of 4.6 metres, a height of 2.2 metres and a depth of 3 metres.

The alterations to the front gable window would involve increasing the height of the gable pitch and depth of the gable window. It would measure a maximum height of 7.65 metres, a width of 2.5 metres and a maximum depth of 3 metres.

The alterations to fenestration would involve the existing windows to be replaced with white UPVC casements; a new front door and the removal of a window and door to the ground floor side elevation to be infilled with render.

It is worth noting that the hardstanding and juliette balcony have been removed from the proposals. The juliette balcony has been removed to accommodate a crown roof to the two storey rear extension.

The property also benefits from a Lawful Development which granted a dormer, similar to the proposed as Lawful under ref. 17/2841/192.

4. Public Consultation

Consultation letters were sent to 12 neighbouring properties. 13 responses have been received in the form of 13 letters of objections. These can be summarised as below:

- Overdevelopment of the property and garden space
- Incongruous form of development
- Overbearing bulk, scale and volume of the proposed extensions
- Overlooking on to neighbouring properties
- Overshadowing and sense of enclosure on neighbouring properties
- Loss of neighbouring privacy, light and visual open space
- The proposed heights and depths of the extension with the additional balcony
- Impact of juliette balcony
- Overhang of the side wall of the extension
- Existing boundary treatment
- Parking issues
- Impact of the proposed hardstanding
- Loss of pedestrian right of way/Impact on pavement
- Waste/refuse facilities
- Protected street tree
- Noise pollution
- Potential for a future HMO
- Proposals impacting the spirit of the community
- Loss of gardens to hardstandings
- Enjoyment of neighbouring patios and gardens lost
- Construction issues
- Potential security issues from trespass
- Neighbouring relations with applicant
- Enroachment on to neighbouring boundaries

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 Government's 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, semidetached 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 in this case are considered to be covered under two main areas:

- 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

Rear Extension

The proposed two-storey rear extension is not found to unduly harm the character of the dwelling or the surrounding area. The rear extension over both storeys would not be immediately viewable from the street scene.

A single storey rear extension currently exists at the property at a depth of approximately 2.7 metres which the proposed single storey rear extension would extend an additional 1.3 metres from at full width of the property. A depth of 4 metres at ground floor would be considered acceptable under the Residential Design Guidance SPD for a detached property. The proposed ground floor element of the two-storey rear extension would develop the property by 48% of its original depth and as such, would not be found to overdevelop the existing property. It is not considered that the proposed depth of the single storey rear extension would be considered to unduly harm the existing appearance of the dwelling due to its sympathetic depth to the existing property. It is also worth noting that this depth for a proposed ground floor rear extension would be acceptable under permitted development and the property benefits from a Lawful Development Certificate for this aspect of the proposal, ref. 17/2841/192.

At the first floor, a depth of 2.6 metres is proposed at full width of the property. Under the Residential Design Guidance SPD, a maximum depth of 3 metres is considered acceptable where enough space exists between the properties. The dwelling is detached and therefore, benefits from space between the properties which properties of other typologies would fail to benefit from. Furthermore, the depth of the proposed rear extension at first floor level would be considered a subordinate depth to not overdevelop the rear of the property or appear bulky and incongruous in relation to the existing dwelling. The original property benefitted from a depth of approximately 8.2 metres. As such, the proposed depth of the

first floor element of the two-storey rear extension would increase the depth of the dwellinghouse by 31% which would be considered to be sympathetic to the original property. The proposed crown roof would be sympathetic to the design of the existing roof slope and its set down of greater than 0.5 metres would be considered to comply with the Residential Design Guidance and ensure the proposed two-storey rear extension remains sympathetic. The proposals would not be found to result on unduly harm on the existing property and site.

The site also benefits from approximately 114 square metres of rear amenity space. The proposed two-storey rear extension would measure 21.2 square metres of ground area. Therefore, it is not considered that the rear extension would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the property or the amenity space for existing and future occupiers.

Extending to the rear of the property is also characteristic of the general locality; the neighbouring flats of No. 14 and 16 Birkbeck Road appear to benefit from a two-storey rear extension, with a flat roof and balcony. Whilst this two-storey rear extension fails to benefit from planning permission, it has existed at the property for over 4 years and therefore would be a lawful extension which would hold some material weight in assessing this application. No. 24 Birkbeck Road also benefits from a two-storey rear extension as part of the permission granted to turn the site from one two-storey property to 2no. semi-detached dwellinghouse granted under ref. H/05915/13 which from satellite imagery has been implemented. As such, it would not be considered out of character of the surrounding area for a two-storey rear extension at the host site. The proposed rear extension would not be found to have a detrimental impact on the character of Birkbeck Road.

Rear Dormer Window

The proposed roof enlargement encompassing a rear dormer window would not be found to have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the property or surrounding area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed dormer window would be larger than half the width of the original roof, as outlined in the Residential Design Guidance SPD, the proposed dormer would be set down from the ridge by approximately 0.6 metres and set in from the eaves by approximately 0.3 metres. Furthermore, the site benefits from a Lawful Development Certificate for the rear dormer window granted under ref. 17/2841/192. The measurements vary slightly from those granted under the Certificate however, the dormer would be considered permitted with a volume of 15.18 cubic metres whilst the proposed crown roof would measure 13 cubic metres. Cumulatively, the proposed development to the roof space would fall under the 50 cubic metres to be considered permitted development. Other properties along Birkbeck Road also benefit from rear dormer windows including No. 22 Birkbeck Road located a property away from the host site and No. 21 and 23 Birkbeck Road.

It is acknowledged that the additional rear extension, proposed under this application, would conflict with the proposed dormer window and therefore, the fall back of permitted development would no longer exist. However, the conflict of the dormer and the proposed crown roof of the two-storey rear extension would not be considered to result in a detrimental harm to warrant refusal. This is due to the property of No. 24 and 24A benefitting from a two-storey rear extension additional to large rear dormers to the main roof slope of both semi-detached properties. This was approved under ref. H/05915/13 and was not considered to have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties or surrounding area. As such, based on the approval at this property allowing similar changes to the main roof space, it would not be considered that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on the appearance and character of the host property and surrounding area of Birkbeck Road.

Front Gable Window

The proposed additional depth and height of the front gable window would be subordinate in their increase with a 0.5 metres increase in the height and a 0.6 metre increase in the depth. These changes would not be considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance and character of the existing property or the surrounding area.

Alterations to fenestration

The alterations to fenestration on all elevations including changes to the windows and doors would be sympathetic in their change and as such, would not be considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance or character of the property or surrounding area.

In summary, the proposed extensions and to the rear and alterations to the front of the property would not be considered to result in unduly harm on the appearance or character of the existing property and surrounding area.

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

It will be important that any scheme addresses 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.

Rear Extension

It is not felt that a detrimental impact would result on the neighbouring properties of the 2no. flats of No. 14/16 Birkbeck Road or No. 20 as a result of the two-storey rear extension and rear dormer window proposed.

At single storey, the proposed extension at a depth of 4 metres would extend the full depth, at a distance of approximately 1 metre from the closest flank wall, of No. 20 Birkbeck Road who fail to benefit from a rear extension on their site. The proposed rear extension at first floor element would meet the shared common boundary between the host site and this neighbouring property. However, a depth of 4 metres would not be considered to result in a loss of light, outlook or a sense of enclosure or overbearing on this neighbouring property. A depth of 4 metres would be considered acceptable under the Residential Design Guidance SPD for a detached property to not detrimentally impact neighbouring amenity. It is also not considered that this part of the proposal would result in overshadowing to the rear of the building and rear amenity space of this property. Furthermore, the proposed ground floor element would not be considered to result in a loss of privacy with no windows located to the side elevations to result in any overlooking to this neighbouring site.

At first floor level, the proposed two-storey rear extension would extend 2.6 metres past the rear wall of this neighbouring property to meet the shared common boundary and exist at a distance of approximately 1 metre from the closest flank wall. This depth would be considered acceptable under the Residential Design Guidance SPD which states that proposed two-storey rear extensions should not extend more than 3 metres in depth when there is a distance of less than 2 metres to the neighbouring boundary. This subordinate depth would not be considered to appear bulky to result in a sense of overshadowing on the neighbouring property or rear amenity space, nor would it result in a loss of light or outlook to the closet habitable first floor window to the rear elevation at No. 20. Furthermore, the proposed depth would not be found to result in a loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring property nor would it be found to result in a sense of enclosure or overbearing. The proposed

depth and height, set down 1.7 metres from the main roof, would ensure the proposed extension is subordinate to not unduly harm the amenities of this neighbouring property.

The proposed ground floor aspect would exist at a distance of 1 metre from the common boundary shared with No. 14/16 and 2.6 metres from the closest flank wall of this property. Due to the two-storey rear extension in situ at this neighbouring property, the ground floor part of the two-storey rear extension would only extend approximately 1.1 metres past the most rearward wall of this neighbouring property. Extending past the rear wall at this subordinate depth would not be considered to result in a loss of light, outlook or a sense of enclosure, overbearing or overshadowing on this neighbouring property and would be compliant with the Residential Design Guidance SPD to protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

At first floor level, the proposed two-storey rear extension would extend no further rearward than the two-storey rear extension existing at the neighbouring property of No.14/16 which exists as 2no. flats. As such, the proposals would not be found to result in any impact on this property through a loss of light, outlook or privacy or a sense of enclosure, overbearing or overshadowing.

Rear Dormer Window

It is worth noting that the amendments to the application resulted in a loss of the Juliette balcony to accommodate a smaller window and the crown roof of the two-storey rear extension.

It is not found that the proposed rear dormer window would result in a loss of amenity to either neighbouring occupiers of No. 14/16 or 20 Birkbeck Road. The proposed dormer, with a subordinate sized window located above, where the crown roof of the two-storey rear extension would meet the dormer, would not be of a size to result in potential overlooking or loss of privacy to the rear amenity space of either neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, the proposed rear dormer window would not be of substantial bulk or scale to result in an overbearing impact on either neighbouring occupiers. As such, the proposals would result in an acceptable impact on both adjoining occupiers.

Front Gable Window

The alterations to the front gable window would be subordinate in their change and would not be found to result in a detrimental impact on the neighbouring amenities of No. 14/16 or 20 Birkbeck. It is not found that the changes would appear overbearing or result in a loss of light or outlook to the adjoining occupiers.

Alterations to fenestration

The alterations to fenestration would not be found to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

In summary, it would not be considered that the proposed two-storey rear extension; rear dormer window and alterations to the front gable window would result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers adjoining the application site.

5.4 Response to Public Consultation

Overdevelopment of the property and garden space

Concerns were raised that the proposed development would result in gross overdevelopment of the rear garden space. The amenity space to the rear of the property has been calculated and it was addressed in the main body of the report that sufficient amenity space would exist to not overdevelop the application site. It has been addressed in the main body of the report that the application would not be considered to overdevelop the existing property.

Incongruous form of development

Concerns were raised the proposed extensions would be an incongruous form of development in relation to the original footprint of the property. This was addressed in the main body of the report and was not found to be an incongruous form of development to be of detriment to the appearance of the property or surrounding area.

Overbearing bulk, scale and volume of the proposed extensions

The consultation period raised the issue that the 2.6 metre depth of the first floor extension with a maximum height of over 8 metres and the 6 metre depth at ground floor would appear overbearing and bulky in its volume. However, throughout the lifetime of the application, amendments were received with a reduction in depth of the ground floor aspect of the two-storey rear extension and to remove the proposed privacy screening which reduced the maximum height of the proposal to 7 metres. The amended depth of 4 metres with the first floor element above was not considered to appear to have significant bulk or scale to appear overbearing on the neighbouring properties.

Overlooking on to neighbouring properties

Concerns were highlighted that overlooking could result as the proposed development could result in compressed living and overdevelopment that would overlook neighbouring properties. As addressed in the main body of the report, it was not found that overlooking could occur on to neighbouring properties.

Overriding the Lawful Development Certificate

Amendments were received throughout the lifetime of the application which reduced the ground floor rear extension to the depth granted lawful under the ref. 17/2841/192.

Overshadowing and sense of enclosure on neighbouring properties

Concerns were raised regarding potential overshadowing and sense of enclosure on neighbouring properties. It has been addressed in the main body of the report that the proposals would not be found to result in a detrimental level of overshadowing and sense of enclosure on the adjoining occupiers.

Loss of neighbouring privacy, light and visual open space

Concerns were raised that the proposed extensions would 'box' in the neighbouring properties which would reduce neighbouring visual open space and light. However, upon assessment from the case officer, it was not found that the proposed extensions would detrimentally affect the light received to the neighbouring properties.

It was also an issue from the consultation that the proposed development at the application site would result in a loss of light to ruin the enjoyment of the patio and garden at neighbouring properties. As addressed in the main body of the report, it would not be considered that the proposals would result in a detrimental loss of light to the rear amenity space of the adjoining occupiers.

Concerns also highlighted how the privacy screening to the upper terrace could impinge the privacy of neighbouring properties. However, the amended plans received have removed the proposed privacy screens. The removal of these will ensure the protection of neighbouring amenities.

The proposed heights and depths of the extension with the additional balcony

The originally proposed balcony has been removed from the plans and as such, would no longer be a concern to this application.

Visual impact of Juliette balcony/privacy screen

The originally proposed Juliette balcony has been removed from the plans and as such, would no longer be a concern to this application.

Overhang of the side wall of the extension/ Enroachment on to neighbouring boundaries

From the amended plans submitted, it is not apparent that the proposed side wall of the extension would overhang on to the boundary of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the plans submitted show the proposals within the red line of the site boundary.

Existing boundary treatment

Concerns were raised that the existing boundary fence to the rear of the property that separates the application site with neighbouring occupiers. Whilst no new boundary treatment is proposed as part of the application, a condition could be attached to the decision to ensure details are received for future boundary treatment to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

The boundary treatment existing between the host site and neighbouring sites to the front of the property was also raised. However, the previously proposed hardstanding has now been removed from this application. As such, any front boundary treatment would not be a material consideration relating to this application.

Parking issues

A number of parking issues were raised from the consultation period. This included a lack of clarity regarding the provision or impact of car access and parking on the site and the impact of parking on the amenity of the street scene. As the hardstanding is no longer part of the proposals and the property will remain in use as a single family dwellinghouse, it is not found that additional parking issues would result from the proposals.

The parking issues relating from other properties located on the street scene were raised as a concern however, any parking problems resulting from neighbouring properties would not be a material consideration in the assessment of this application.

Impact of the proposed hardstanding

A number of concerns were raised from the consultation period about the impact of the proposed hardstanding resulting in a loss of on-street parking from a dropped kerb which would add additional strain on the parking of the street and result in the loss of a right of way for pedestrians. Furthermore, the issues of dangerous driving and use of the pavement by cars causing safety concerns for children, elderly residents and pedestrians also arose from public consultation. However, the hardstanding is no longer part of the proposed development under this application and as such, no impact on parking in the surrounding area should result.

Waste/refuse facilities

Issues were raised about the lacking provision for waste and refuse facilities on site which could attract vermin and pose a health hazard. However, it would not be found that evidence of refuse and recycling facilities would be necessary to this application. Any concerns regarding vermin should be directed to Environmental Health.

Protected street tree

As changes are no longer being made to the hardstanding and all extensions will be to the rear of the property, the protected street tree would no longer be a concern to this application.

Noise pollution

Noise pollution was raised as an issue during the consultation period. The proposed balcony has been removed from the plans and as such, this would prevent the occupiers using this space. Furthermore, the proposed two-storey rear extension and rear dormer window would not be considered to result in additional noise from the property. As of 29th May 2016, the London Borough of Barnet's Planning Authority executed a borough-wide Article 4 Direction making it a mandatory requirement to obtain planning permission anywhere within Barnet to convert a dwelling house (Use Class C3) to a small HMO (Use Class C4) where between 3 and 6 unrelated people share basic amenities (e.g. such as a kitchen or bathroom).

Potential for a future HMO

Under these proposals, the applicant is not applying for a change of use of the property to a HMO. Should the applicant wish to convert the property into a HMO, then a full planning application would need to be submitted to the council to be assessed.

Proposals impacting the spirit of the community

Concerns were raised about the proposals resulting in a loss of community spirit in the area. This was particularly in relation to the hardstanding which has now been removed from the plans. This would not be considered a material consideration in the assessment of this planning application.

Loss of gardens to hardstandings

Concerns were also raised by consultees that there is a loss of gardens to be replaced with hardstandings in the area which can impact the absorption of CO₂ and the health of the local area. The hardstanding is no longer part of the proposed development under this

application and therefore, no loss of the garden should result from these approvals, if approved at committee.

Impact on water use and sewage/roof drainage

The impact on water use and sewage in the surrounding area would not be a material consideration in the assessment of this application.

Concerns were also raised highlighting that no drainage has been indicated on the plans for the roof of the two-storey rear extension. This would not be a material consideration in the assessment of this planning application.

Loss of views

Concerns were raised about the loss of views from neighbouring bedrooms due to the proposed extensions. However, the loss of views would not be considered a material consideration in the assessment of this application.

Construction issues

Issues raising from the construction of the proposed two-storey rear extension and rear dormer window such as the erection of scaffolding; the degradation of the boundary fence from construction works and dust and dirt from the work would not be considered a material consideration in assessing this application. Noise from the works could be controlled with a planning condition to prevent works during certain hours.

Potential security issues from trespassing

Issues were raised about the risk to security of neighbouring sites from the changes to boundary treatment and during the period of construction works. However, these issues would not be a material consideration and any security risks from trespassing would need to be reported to the local police

Neighbouring relations with applicant

The relation of the applicant with neighbouring occupiers would not be considered a material consideration nor would a Party Wall Agreement. This would be considered a civil dispute.

6. Equality and Diversity Issues

The proposals do not conflict with either Barnet Council's Equalities Policy or the commitments set in our 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, this proposal complies with the Adopted Barnet Local Plan policies and guidance and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This application is therefore recommended for APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

