

Location 32 Rowsley Avenue London NW4 1AJ

Reference: 20/5924/HSE Received: 8th December 2020
Accepted: 8th December 2020

Ward: Hendon Expiry 2nd February 2021

Case Officer: John Sperling

Applicant: Mallerton Ltd

Proposal: Single storey rear infill extensions between existing ground floor extensions. Erection of approved first floor rear extension

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Approve subject to conditions

AND the Committee grants delegated authority to the Service Director – Planning and Building Control 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 their 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:

032RO-A-01-001 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-01-002 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-02-001 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-02-002 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-02-101 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-02-102 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-03-001 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-03-002 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-03-003 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-03-004 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-03-101 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-03-102 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-03-103 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-03-104 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-05-001 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-05-002 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-05-101 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-05-102 - received 16/02/2021

032RO-A-06-001 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-06-002 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-06-003 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-06-004 - received 08/12/2020
032RO-A-06-101 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-06-102 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-06-103 - received 16/02/2021
032RO-A-06-104 - received 16/02/2021

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).

- 5 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 elevations, of the extension hereby approved, facing Nos 30 and 34 Rowsley Avenue.

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).

Informative(s):

- 1 In accordance with paragraphs 38-57 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. 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 comprises a semi-detached dwellinghouse, located on the eastern side of Rowsley Avenue. To the south, the host dwelling directly adjoins No.30 Rowsley Avenue, to the north, the application site shares a common boundary with No.34 Rowsley Avenue. To the rear, the application site abuts Nos 29 and 31 Downage.

The area is characterised by similar two storey semi-detached properties with amenity space to the rear and off-street parking facilities to the front.

The application site does not comprise a listed building and does not fall within a conservation area.

2. Relevant Site History

Reference: 18/6698/PNH

Address: 32 Rowsley Avenue, London, NW4 1AJ

Decision: Prior Approval Not Required

Decision Date: 17 December 2018

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: 18/6973/HSE

Address: 32 Rowsley Avenue, London, NW4 1AJ

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 23 January 2019

Description: Single storey side and rear extension. New raised terrace area with associated access steps to garden level. New front porch

Reference: 19/6017/192

Address: 32 Rowsley Avenue, London, NW4 1AJ

Decision: Lawful

Decision Date: 11 November 2019

Description: Roof extension involving hip to gable, rear dormer window and 2no front facing rooflights

Reference: 19/5234/HSE

Address: 32 Rowsley Avenue, London, NW4 1AJ

Decision: Approved subject to conditions

Decision Date: 30 January 2020

Description: Single storey side and rear extension. First floor rear extension. New raised terrace area with associated access steps to garden level. New front porch (AMENDED DESCRIPTION).

Reference: 20/2488/HSE

Address: 32 Rowsley Avenue, London, NW4 1AJ

Decision: Refused

Decision Date: 21 October 2020

Description: Amalgamation of the ground floor rear extension with crown roof. Erection of ground floor side and first floor rear extension (AMENDED PLANS).

3. Proposal

This application seeks full planning permission for the "Single storey rear infill extensions between existing ground floor extensions. Erection of approved first floor rear extension."

The existing roof extension approved under 19/6017/192 is insitu at the application site.

The proposed application seeks to infill the ground floor rear extensions approved under prior notification reference number 18/6698/PNH. This proposed element would extend to the existing rear wall of the existing extensions and measure the same height of 3 metres. No crown roof element is proposed. The previously approved front porch is also noted to be removed from the current application.

The current application removes the front porch approved under the previous application (20/2488/HSE) and retains the depth and width of first floor rear extension under planning reference number 19/5234/HSE. The current application proposed reduces the maximum height of the crowned roofed element by 0.19 metres and widens the rear fenestration on the proposed first floor rear extension.

The current application removes the rear patio approved under planning reference number 19/5234/HSE.

4. Public Consultation

No.16 original consultees letters were distributed and, for the sake of completeness, 12no objections have been received in the lifetime of the application. These objections came from a total of 11 addresses:

- Loss of vegetation as a result of works already completed to the property and that this is not consistent with the character of the area.
- Increased floor space will result in increased parking pressures.
- Increased depth of ground floor rear extension than previously approved applications 18/6973/HSE and 19/5234/HSE.
- Neighbour not consulted on prior approval application, which is overbearing and limits outlook from neighbouring windows.

- Materials are also not consistent with neighbouring property.
- Infill of existing extensions is not considered as permitted development.
- Cumulative impact of the already built single storey rear ground floor extension by virtue of its height, siting, and excessive rearward projection would cause an unacceptable loss of outlook and overbearing sense of enclosure to neighbours' habitable rooms and gardens and to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to established policies (Sep 2020, Hendon Area Councillors' Planning Committee).
- The erection of first floor rear side extension closest to No 34, which I understand was approved under a prior application numbered 19/5234/HSE, will worsen loss of privacy and visual amenity already resulting from this overdevelopment.
- The drawings in page 5 of this application lack dimensions and do not show depth and width of the rear ground floor extension.
- The proposed roof of this first-floor extension is excessive and unnecessarily high; its shape is out of character and disproportionate whereas a flat roof would be more in character and proportionate.
- Scale and depth of first floor rear extension excessive and overbearing to neighbouring residents.
- No detail is provided as to why application reference number was approved 18/6698/PNH.
- The current application proposes to fill in precisely the already built 6m extension (s), which is oversized, causing significant overshadowing and distress, employs inappropriate material, and it may not constitute permitted development.
- Development is disproportionate within the dimensions of the neighbouring properties.
- Extension has replaced mature hedge which is a significant loss of character.
- Will the Council be minded to impose a condition that the concrete walls are finished off in red brick, which will be materials more in keeping with the character of the original building?
- Impact to nature as a result of extensive works.
- Development at No 32 apparently does not align with the expected good design stated in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which is a key aspect of sustainable growth. The current extension does not favour in any apparent sense the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- I request the Council to consider that the 6m deep rear ground floor extension is reduced to a maximum of 3m depth from the original rear wall; the proposed (2m) first floor rear side extension projects no deeper than the first floor bay window in No 30, 32 (proposed) and 34, and have flat roof; and only matching bricks are employed where required.
- The plans submitted suggest that the building would be for multiple occupancy which would impact the parking on the street. This would stress existing arrangement as staff from the hospital park use nearby road parking spots for the whole day.
- Removal of vegetation creates drainage problems at the of the of the road.
- The applicant has shown verbally aggressive and threatening behaviour towards me and my family for being one of the neighbours that objected to the previous planning application that was refused.
- Suspicion remains that the property will be converted into flats, which is out of character in the road.
- Loss of privacy and light on the neighbouring residents.
- Neighbouring residents have received bribes and threatened by the developer.

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 Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in February 2019. 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.

Existing policies in Barnet's Local Plan (2012) should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the revised NPPF.

The Mayor's London Plan 2021

The new London Plan which sets out the Mayor's overarching strategic planning framework for the next 20 to 25 years was adopted on the 2nd March 2021 and supersedes the previous 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 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.

Barnet's Local Plan (Reg 18) 2020

Barnet's Local Plan -Reg 18 Preferred Approach was approved for consultation on 6th January 2020. The Reg 18 document sets out the Council's preferred policy approach together with draft development proposals for 67 sites. It is Barnet's emerging Local Plan. The Local Plan 2012 remains the statutory development plan for Barnet until such stage as the replacement plan is adopted and as such applications should continue to be determined in accordance with the 2012 Local Plan, while noting that account needs to be taken of emerging policies and draft site proposals.

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016)

- Sets out information for applicants to help them design developments which would receive favourable consideration by the Local Planning Authority. 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 developments 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 it states that developments 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 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

Impact on the character and appearance of the property and general locality (Principle):

Any proposed scheme for the 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 development plan policies such as DM01, CS05 (both of the Barnet Local Plan), 7.4 and 7.6 (both of the London Plan).

Policy DM01 states that all proposals should preserve and enhance the local character of the area. This application relates to the amalgamation of the ground floor rear extension with crown roof, first floor rear extension and front porch.

It is noted that the ground floor rear extensions approved under reference number 18/6698/PNH have been constructed. As such, they constitute a material fall-back position for the consideration of this application - and consequently, the scope of the works at ground floor level are limited to the infilling of the 0.5m gap between the existing two extensions and retaining its height of 3 metre.

On that basis, the infilling of the gap made between the two existing extensions to form a flush rear elevation is not in itself considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property.

In regards to the proposed first floor rear extension, it is considered that the assessment made under planning reference number 19/5234/HSE is relevant in this instance. In determining that application, the delegated report reads as follows:

Paragraph 14.23 of Barnet's Residential Design Guidance (2016) states that two storey rear extensions which are closer than 2 metres to a neighbouring boundary and project more than 3 metres in depth are not normally considered acceptable. It is noted that the proposal is 2 metres in depth and is situated 2.5 metres from No.30 and 3.7 metres from No.34. The first floor rear extension would be set away from the first floor rear bay window so would be compliant with Paragraph 14.11 of Barnet's SPD (2016). As such, the proposal would appear sympathetic and not overly bulky or dominant in the context of the dwellinghouse and surrounding area. Having assessed the wider area, it is seen that numerous properties on the eastern side of Rowsley Avenue benefit from flat roofed two storey rear extensions. Given this element of the proposal is subordinate and sympathetically design the proposal is not considered to conflict with the character of the wider locality.

In addition to the above, it is noted that the proposed rear elevations indicate that the first floor rear extension would appear taller than the previously refused application 20/2488/HSE. However, this is as a result of removing the crown roofed element on the ground floor extension and does not represent an increase in the overall height of the first floor rear extension. Upon review, it was noted that the overall appearance of the first floor rear extensions (and fenestration involved) would appear visually incongruent although not to the degree to warrant the application for refusal in its own right. Amendments were sought to address this point of concern so as to reduce its bulk and create a more harmonious rear elevation that is in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and wider area.

In regards to the ground floor side extension, again a similar proposal was made under reference number 19/5234/HSE, although removing the sloped roof element. With regard to that element, the delegated report stated the following:

The proposed side extension would measure a depth of 9.06 metres, nearest to the boundary with No. 34, wrapping around to adjoin the proposed rear extension. Barnet's

Residential Design Guidance SPD outlines that side extensions to existing buildings can be unacceptably prominent features in the streetscene, it goes on to stipulate that side extensions should not be more than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.

The host dwellinghouse measures a width of 7.50 metres, the proposed side extension would measure a width of 2.74, and therefore the proposed side extension is in compliance with the aforementioned guidance, officers have raised no concerns regarding its impact on the streetscene.

In this current application, it is noted the height of the side extensions has been altered to account for the level change experienced across the cross-section of the dwelling. It is noted however, that the extension would not further add to the height approved under 19/5234/HSE so is considered to be acceptable. Overall, officers consider that the proposal is sympathetic and subordinate to the existing property, streetscene and general locality. It is not considered that the side extension would harm the character of the local area.

From the rear element of the approved side extension, an additional rear extension would extend 3 metres in depth, 2.47 metres wide and 3.5 metres in height. This element is noted to be 0.5 metres taller than the proposed ground floor infill and existing extension, but by virtue of this extension being located nearby the boundary of the site and being level with the height of the neighbouring extension, not considered to result in a deleterious impact to the character and appearance of the dwelling nor appear overly conflicting within the character of the wider locality.

As such, it is found that - within the context of the existing works, previous approvals and minimal change thereof - the proposed extensions would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwellinghouse, the surrounding locality or the wider area. Therefore, the proposal would comply with policy DM01 of Barnet's Development Management Policies DPD.

Impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers:

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.

The reason for refusal under planning reference number 20/2488/HSE states the following:

"The cumulative impact of the proposed formation of a crown roof to the existing ground floor rear extension, by virtue of its height, siting, and excessive rearward projection, would give rise to an unacceptable loss of outlook and overbearing sense of enclosure to the rear habitable rooms and garden of No 30 Rowsley Avenue, to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policy CS5 of the LB Barnet: Local Plan (Core Strategy) DPD (2012), Policies DM01 of the LB Barnet: Local Plan (Development Management Policies) DPD (2012) and the Residential Design Guide SPD (2016)."

In light of this decision, the applicant removed the crown roof from the proposed development. With this alteration, the ground floor extension would measure a height of 3 metres from ground floor level. Given the proposed element would be sandwiched

between two existing extensions, which was approved and built according to the prior approval large home extensions scheme, no harm would be experienced by the neighbouring residents at No.30 to the detriment of their amenity. When viewing the cumulative footprint of the ground floor rear extensions (the existing and proposed elements combined) any impact to the neighbouring residents is considered to be offset by virtue of the distance of the extension from the neighbouring boundary and its height of 3 metres reducing the visual manifestation so as to avoid any unacceptable sense of overbearance on the neighbouring residents at No.30 Rowsley Avenue.

In regards to the extension situated on the boundary wall with No.30 Rowsley Avenue, the proposed is noted to extend 1.7 metres further than the rear wall of the neighbouring property. This protrusion is not considered to result in detrimental harm to the neighbouring residents by reason of loss of light, outlook and sense of enclosure to warrant the application for refusal.

In order to ensure the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers is not compromised, by way of overlooking, a condition will be applied to ensure that the roof of the ground floor side and rear extension will 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.

Due to the subordinate scale and distance from respective neighbouring properties, the proposed first floor rear extension is not considered to be unacceptably overbearing on the neighbouring occupiers no result in a significant loss of outlook to the detriment of the occupiers.

Overall, officers do not consider that the proposal would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, and as such would comply with Policy DM01 of Barnet's Development Management Policies DPD.

5.4 Response to Public Consultation

- Increased floor space will result in increased parking pressures.

The proposed extensions would remain a single family dwelling and is not considered to worsen parking pressure with regards to the expectations of Policy DM17

- Increased depth of ground floor rear extension than previously approved applications 18/6973/HSE and 19/5234/HSE.

The current application does represent alterations to the previous decisions however, as highlighted in the delegated report, is considered to be acceptable on character and amenity grounds.

- Neighbour not consulted on prior approval application, which is overbearing and limits outlook from neighbouring windows.
Materials are also not consistent with neighbouring property.

The LPA issued consultation letters to the neighbouring properties under planning reference number 18/6698/PNH in accordance with the obligations in the Order. The materials of the extension were not specified under this permission, but would be required to be of similar appearance

- Infill of existing extensions is not considered as permitted development.

The infill element proposed between the existing prior approval extensions is not considered permitted development. The current application is a planning application and proposing the infill element is not contentious in principle. As highlighted in the main body of the report, the infill element is acceptable on character and amenity grounds.

- Cumulative impact of the already built single storey rear ground floor extension by virtue of its height, siting, and excessive rearward projection would cause an unacceptable loss of outlook and overbearing sense of enclosure to neighbours' habitable rooms and gardens and to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to established policies (Sep 2020, Hendon Area Councillors' Planning Committee).

As highlighted in the main body of the report, the current application is considered to be materially different from the refused application under planning reference number 20/2488/HSE so as to address the concerns raised by committee members.

- The erection of first floor rear side extension closest to No 34, which I understand was approved under a prior application numbered 19/5234/HSE, will worsen loss of privacy and visual amenity already resulting from this overdevelopment.

The first floor rear extension approved under planning reference number 19/5234/HSE is no larger than the first floor rear extension currently proposed. As highlighted in the main body of the report, the impact to neighbouring residential amenity is not considered harmful.

- The drawings in page 5 of this application lack dimensions and do not show depth and width of the rear ground floor extension.

The drawings provided include capacity to measure the proposed development at scale. It is not a requirement to annotate all dimensions of the proposed development at validation stage and was not deemed necessary in this instance.

- The proposed roof of this first-floor extension is excessive and unnecessarily high; its shape is out of character and disproportionate whereas a flat roof would be more in character and proportionate.

The LPA notes that the first floor rear extension appears taller due to the removal of the crowned roof under planning reference number 20/2488/HSE. As discussed in the main body of the report, the proposed first floor rear extension is a subordinate addition to the dwelling by virtue of its scale, massing and positioning.

- Scale and depth of first floor rear extension excessive and overbearing to neighbouring residents.

As discussed in the main body of the report, the proposed first floor rear extension is found to have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring residents.

- No detail is provided as to why application reference number was approved 18/6698/PNH.

Planning reference number 18/6698/PNH was approved as it satisfied the requirements of Class A (g) of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 - as amended in 2016 by SI 2016 No. 332.

- The current application proposes to fill in precisely the already built 6m extension(s), which is oversized, causing significant overshadowing and distress, employs inappropriate material, and it may not constitute permitted development.

The existing prior approval ground rear extensions have been substantially completed according to the dimensions approved under planning reference number 18/6698/PNH. As such, these extensions are absolved from their reliance on permitted development rights. The completion of the extension allows for the accumulative development to have been constructed in two separate phases each reliant on its own permission.

- Development is disproportionate within the dimensions of the neighbouring properties.

As discussed in the main body of the report, the proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character of the wider area.

- Extension has replaced mature hedge which is a significant loss of character.

The construction of the prior approval single storey rear extension involved removing the mature hedging on the boundary line with No.30. This removal has already occurred and does not fall within the realm of the proposed development under the current application. No TPO's are on site.

- Will the Council be minded to impose a condition that the concrete walls are finished off in red brick, which will be materials more in keeping with the character of the original building?

The delegated decision, under Condition 3, includes a 'Materials to match' condition on the proposed development.

- Impact to nature as a result of extensive works.

Within the context of the permitted development works already undertaken, the proposal is not considered to result in material harm to nature

- Development at No 32 apparently does not align with the expected good design stated in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which is a key aspect of sustainable growth. The current extension does not favour in any apparent sense the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For the reasons stated in the main body of the report, the proposed development is considered acceptable under Barnet planning policies, which forms a material weight in the assessment of the development in question.

- I request the Council to consider that the 6m deep rear ground floor extension is reduced to a maximum of 3m depth from the original rear wall; the proposed (2m) first floor rear side extension projects no deeper than the first floor bay window in No 30, 32 (proposed) and 34, and have flat roof; and only matching bricks are employed where required.

The 6 metre ground floor rear extensions were approved under planning reference number 18/6698/PNH and built accordingly. The LPA cannot enforce reducing a development which was lawfully approved.

- The plans submitted suggest that the building would be for multiple occupancy which would impact the parking on the street. This would stress existing arrangement as staff from the hospital park use nearby road parking spots for the whole day.

The drawings attached to the application provide no indication that the building will be used for multiple occupancy but will instead remain as a single family dwellinghouse. Further planning permission would be required to convert the existing single family dwellinghouse into an HMO or flats.

- Removal of vegetation creates drainage problems at the of the of the road.

This is not a material planning consideration, though it may constitute a civil issue between the relevant parties. Works would be required to be carried out in accordance with Building Regulations

- Loss of privacy and light on the neighbouring residents.

As discussed in the main body of the report, the proposed extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the neighbouring residents.

- Those who objected have received bribes, threatened and verbally aggressive by the developer.

This is not a material planning consideration for assessment under a planning application. Residents area advised to report anti-social or threatening behaviour to the Police

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 an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This application is therefore recommended for APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

