

**Location**                            **91 And 91A Longmore Avenue Barnet EN5 1JZ**

**Reference:**                        **18/2590/HSE**                            Received: 30th April 2018  
Accepted: 1st May 2018

Ward:                                    Oakleigh                                    Expiry 26th June 2018

Applicant:                            Mr Darren Webber

Proposal:                              Extension to roof including raising the ridge height to part of the roof to 91 Longmore Road. Single storey side extension and new front porch with pitched roof following removal of existing porch to side elevation. Extension to roof including raising the ridge height of the roof to match 91, with hip to gable end and 1no rear dormer, 1no rooflight to front elevation and 1no roof window to side elevation. Associated alterations to fenestration and landscaping including new boundary fencing to 91A Longmore Road

**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 additions to the dwellings at 91 and 91A Longmore Avenue, by reason of their size, siting and design would be disproportionate additions which would not respect the appearance, scale, mass, and pattern of the host building and unbalance the symmetry shared between the original semi-detached dwellings at 91 and 93 Longmore Avenue. The proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscene, contrary to policies CS1 and CS5 of Barnet's Adopted Core Strategy (2012), policy DM01 of the Adopted Development Management Policies DPD (2012) and the Adopted Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016).

**Informative(s):**

- 1     The plans accompanying this application are:

- Design and Access Statement, prepared by Teal Planning
- Cover letter, dated 28 April, written by Teal Planning
- Drawing no. 2016- 580/103 Rev B

2 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.

## **Officer's Assessment**

### **1. Site Description and History**

The subject site is located on the southern side of Longmore Avenue, and consists of two dwellinghouses; 91 and 91A Longmore Avenue.

91 Longmore Avenue is the original dwelling, of which was a semi-detached dwelling that was granted a two-storey side extension under planning reference no. N09997A. A requirement of this extension was that the extension be subordinate to the host building to preserve the character and symmetry between no. 91 and the semi-detached pair at no. 93 Longmore Avenue. Following the construction of the extension, subdivision of the two storey element was sought and granted planning permission under reference no. N09997B/06 for the side extensions to be converted into a separate dwelling; namely No. 91A Longmore Avenue and resulting in the creation of what is ultimately a set of 3 terrace properties. However still maintaining the subordination in which the dwelling houses could still be seen as a pair within the street scene. As a result of the subdivision consent permitted development rights were removed from 91A Longmore Avenue.

The site is not located within a conservation area, nor is it subject to an article 4 direction.

### **2. Planning History**

Reference: 16/8178/HSE

Address: 91 and 91A Longmore Avenue

Decision: Refused

Decision Date: 3 April 2017

Description: Two storey rear extension to both properties

Reference: 16/6009/HSE

Address: 91A Longmore Avenue

Decision: Refused

Decision Date: 9 November 2016

Description: Roof extension involving hip to gable, raising of the ridge height, rear dormer window with 1no. rooflights to front elevation to facilitate a loft conversion

Reference: 16/4416/HSE

Address: 91A Longmore Avenue

Decision: Refused

Decision Date: 30 August 2016

Description: Roof extension involving hip to gable, raising of the ridge height, rear dormer window with 1no. rooflights to front elevation to facilitate a loft conversion

Reference: N09997B/06

Address: 91 Longmore Avenue

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 19 April 2006

Description: Conversion of property into two self-contained units. New french doors to existing rear conservatory.

Reference: N09997A

Address: 91 Longmore Avenue

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 14 July 1993

Description: Two storey side extension

### **3. Proposal**

The proposal seeks to undertake the following works:

- Undertake a hip to gable roof extension over both 91 and 91A Longmore Avenue; this will see the ridgeline of 91A Raised to be flush with that of the original building ridge height, with a maximum height of 8.7 metres. This will also remove the remaining portion of the hipped roof at no. 91.

Construct a rear dormer on the extended roof of no. 91A; the dormer will have a maximum height of 2.66 metres above the roofline, will extend a maximum depth of 3.2 metres out from the roofline, and will have a width of 3.76 metres.

- Single storey side extension to no. 91A will extend up to the boundary which will protrude 1.2 metres out from the flank elevation, and will be flush with the front elevation of the dwellinghouse and extend up to the full depth of the original building to approx.9m in depth. The side extension will have an irregular lean-to roof with a maximum height of 3.9 metres at the front of the property, decreasing to a maximum height of 3.66 metres at the rear of the dwelling, with a maximum eaves height of 2.9 metres. This extension will include a series of 4 high level windows along the flank elevation and a new front entrance door.

The side extension will incorporate the new front porch with the introduction of a new front entrance door with a gable over to match the entrances to both 91 and 93 Longmore Avenue.

- The proposal also seeks to install one new front roof light and one new gable window on the flank elevation.

This application has been called in to committee by Councillor Rajput who requested that committee should consider the application using their local knowledge and make an informed decision as to whether the application is in keeping with neighbouring properties and does not cause offence by the size, bulk, style etc of that which is sought.

### **4. Public Consultation**

Consultation letters were sent to 8 neighbouring properties.

12 responses in support of the application have been received.

The letters of support can be summarised as follows:

- This is a separate dwelling, paying its own council tax and it should have the same opportunities every other property has in Barnet
- Refusing the application will result in the family having to move out of the neighbourhood/Barnet
- The proposal will have no impact on the neighbouring properties.
- Will enable the occupants to remain part of the community

- Plans are similar to the alterations that were undertaken to 60 Longmore Avenue
- The hip to gable extensions would improve the roof line and would be more in keeping with the general street scene
- The proposal will improve the leaking roof of no. 91
- It will allow the occupants of no. 91 to continue to have family members living next door
- Rules made in 1990/2006 need to be changed/relaxed
- The property at 89 Longmore will not be affected because of the large vehicle access way

## **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.

#### The Draft London Plan

'Whilst capable of being a material consideration, at this early stage very limited weight should be attached to the Draft London Plan. Although this weight will increase as the Draft London Plan progresses to examination stage and beyond, applications should continue to be determined in accordance with the 2016 London Plan.'

#### 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 development as set out in Policy DM01 is to minimise the 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

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

## **5.3 Assessment of proposals**

### Impact on character of host building and street scene

As stated above, the dwelling at no. 91A was created through the subdivision of an extension off the semi-detached dwelling of 91 Longmore Avenue. At the time of the extension being granted planning permission, it was made clear by the LPA that such an extension had to remain subordinate to the original building in order to preserve the well-balanced symmetry of the semi-detached pairing of dwellings (being no. 91 and 93). As a result, the roof height of the extension was set down approximately 1 metre from the ridgeline of no. 91. This approach is still taken by the LPA in assessing planning proposals against policy DM01 of the Local Development Plan, and through the application of the Residential Design Guidance SPD.

The proposal would be contrary to the advice contained in the councils SPD and policy DM01, resulting in the conversion of a building of a subordinate nature, into an unbalanced row of terrace properties where one end terrace has a gable end and the other has a hipped end. The applicant has suggested that there are examples of this being done further to the east in Longmore Avenue; however, upon looking into these examples it was noted that these dwellings were constructed as terrace properties and although they are not symmetrical, this is not considered to offer a precedent that would justify the proposed hip to gable roof extensions across 91 and 91A, and the loss of the symmetrical relationship with no. 93. It is further noted that the vast majority of properties in the

immediate area are semi-detached dwellings that have retained their symmetrical relationship within the pairings.

With regards to the proposed rear dormer, this is of a scale that is considered to be discordant with the proportions of the host dwelling at no. 91A; the Residential Design Guidance SPD suggests that dormers should be half the width and half the height of the roof slope, so as to not dominate the original roof slope. The proposed rear dormer occupies the entire original roof slope and in conjunction with the hip to gable roof extension, which would subsume the original roof form.

As stated above, there have been several other applications submitted for similar proposals on this site to raise the ridgeline of 91A, most notably under reference no. 16/6009/HSE. These applications have been refused on the basis that the impact of the roof extensions (including the scale of the rear dormer) on the character of the host building and streetscene would be unacceptable, particularly when 91A was designed to be subordinate. This demonstrates the Council's priority to maintain the subordination of 91A from 91 and 93 Longmore Avenue.

In addition to the roof extensions the proposal also proposes to alter the existing first floor rear roof form from pitched to a flat roof. Generally a flat roof over first floor rear extension is not considered to be acceptable by the council and considered to be an unsympathetic addition to the building, detracting from the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding properties in the area. Contrary to the advice contained in the residential design guidance SPD.

The side extension, although when viewed in isolation has minimal width, this is flush with the front elevation with the introduction of a new front entrance door which further results in the detracting from the symmetry of the original semi-detached pair of dwellings at 91 and 93.

For these reasons discussed above, the proposed works are considered to be discordant and incongruous additions to both 91 and 91A Longmore Avenue, and will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, and unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair with No. 93 Longmore Avenue.

#### Impact on the amenities of neighbours

The properties to the west of the subject site will be screened from the side extension by the existing building, and the additional bulk introduced through the increased roof height of both 91 and 91A Longmore Avenue will not intrude on the outlook of these properties. Similarly, the properties to the east are separated from the site by approximately 6 metres and as a result, despite the additional height that will be introduced, the outlook and sunlight access of this property is not considered to be impacted. The windows that will be inserted on the side elevations of no. 91A as a result of the proposal are either of a height above ground level that will not facilitate overlooking into the neighbouring property, or are shown to be obscure glazed at first and second floor.

Properties to the north of the site are sufficiently separated from the proposed additions by the public highway, rendering any impact on their residential amenity minimal.

There are no properties to the south that are considered to be impacted.

For the abovementioned reasons, the proposal is not considered to impact the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

#### **5.4 Response to Public Consultation**

The matters raised through submissions are not material planning considerations. However, further comments can be made on comments made to:

out of date policies should be updated. - It should be noted that Council's policies and relevant supplementary planning documents such as Residential Design Guidance and DM policies are the up to date/approved local policies that officers consistently apply to all planning applications so a consistent approach is maintained across the whole borough. The application has been assessed and considered having due regard to these policies.

#### **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**

The proposal is considered to result in discordant and incongruous additions to both 91 and 91A Longmore Avenue that will be detrimental to the character of the host building and unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair which these two buildings form part of. The proposal would be contrary to council's policies and appear visually obtrusive within the street scene, contrary to the Local Development Plan and the Residential Design Guidance SPD and is therefore recommended for REFUSAL.



Site Location Plan

