

**DESIGN STATEMENT**

**For**

**MR & MRS A. CARBONI**

**36 THE MALL**

**LONDON**

**N14 6LN**

**Ref: 2311**

**April 2024**

## **Contents**

1. Introduction – Proposed Development
2. Pre-application Advice
3. Physical Context
4. Social Context
5. Planning Policy
6. Use
7. Materials
8. Scale & Design
9. Impact on Amenity
10. Compliance with Planning Policy
11. Conclusion

## **DESIGN STATEMENT**

Project: **36 THE MALL LONDON N14 6LN**

Project Number: **2311**      Date: **April 2024**

### **1. Introduction – Proposed Development**

The application seeks householder planning permission for the removal of the existing rear elevation glass conservatory wall and to provide a rear elevation extension.

### **2. Pre Application Advice**

Pre-application advice has not been sought on this particular application.

However, an officers report has been consulted and the advice has been used to make this application to enable the current application to address the requirements. Applications for similar rear extensions have recently been approved and officers' reports have broadly indicated what requirements have been necessary to achieve a successful planning approval in this particular application. Local representations to similar applications have received no objections.

A householder application has been submitted for Policy reasons in respect to Permitted development.

This application will seek to address any particular issues of the impact on the character and appearance of the buildings and surrounding amenity.

### **3. Physical Context and Character & Appearance**

#### **The Existing Building**

The proposal is for the removal of a rear elevation glass conservatory which is no longer fit for purpose within this residential domestic setting and replacement with a well designed rear extension to this single family dwelling.

The existing building is a two storey Edwardian semi-detached house on the south side of The Mall.

The property is not located within a Conservation Area and is notably double fronted with slate roofs and having fair faced soft red brickwork with soft red brick quoins to timber sash window surrounds. To the rear an outrigger extension with pitched prominent roof style.

The house has not been previously extended from the original house with the exception of the infill glass conservatory to the south of the site between 34 The Mall. The infill glass conservatory is an original part of the building on this style of house within The Mall.

The property is built of Gault brickwork in Flemish Bond and soft red facing stock brickwork fair faced to all elevations with painted timber sash windows to the front and rear elevation. The roof is a grey slate pitch roof to the front and rear elevations.

The existing entrance to the house is at ground level with a small flight of steps to the ground floor. The floor level sets down 320mm to the rear floor level.

The property is a single family dwelling on ground & first floor. There is level access through to the principal rooms on the ground floor to the front.

The rear conservatory extension has a brick plinth with timber windows and a glass roof. The conservatory is no longer fit for purpose or appropriate for the proposals for extending the property or family needs.

The side and rear of the property have no public vantage points and has restricted views from the surrounding rear gardens and upper floor windows of the properties within The Mall. There are 30m south facing gardens.

#### **4. Social Context**

The proposal although on modest scale is likely to contribute to the local economy, by providing jobs for local people. In addition the majority of materials are to be sourced locally with reclaimed and reusable materials from the host building therefore representing an opportunity to contribute to the local economy and environment.

#### **5. Planning Policy**

CP30 of the Core Strategy requires new development to be of a high-quality design and in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. DMD8 of the Development Management Document seeks to ensure that development is high quality, sustainable, has regard for and enhances local character; and DMD37 states that development that is not suitable for its intended function, that is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings may be refused.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DMD8 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

London Plan Policy D3 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting planning assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated planning assets.

## **6. Use**

The current use of the site is for residential purposes (C3). It is not proposed to change this use.

## **7. Materials**

As many reclaimed materials will be re-used from the host building saved during the project works and if not sufficient materials are saved, new materials will match the existing as closely as practical.

## **8. Scale & Design**

The external alteration required in this proposal is for the removal of the rear elevation infill glass conservatory and the replacement of a rear extension in keeping, although subordinate to the host building whilst provide appropriate and good standard of accommodation required for this family house.

The proposed rear boundary wall will not exceed the height of the existing wall and the eaves of the adjoining roof will meet the height requirement where extensions meet the boundary.

The immediate adjoining neighbour has been consulted in this proposal and the owners have no objections to this proposed rear infill extension.

The proposed extension is neither excessive in terms of scale or design. There appears to be some historical precedent to these particular semi-detached houses on the Mall in so far as the conservatory infill extensions are largely original in addition to which there are similar infill extensions at 12 & 14, 66 & 68 and 70 & 72 The Mall.

## **9. Impact on Amenity**

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

There is considered to be no impact on the living conditions of occupants of the neighbouring residential property. It is considered that the scheme is of good design and in keeping with the style and pattern of numerous already permitted schemes along The Mall and other surrounding streets

There would be no amenity impact. The rear of the property faces South with a 30m rear garden. The proposal in this application would not therefore impact the amenity of the property at 38 The Mall being set away from the boundary by a minimum of 5.7m.

There would be no amenity impact. The rear of the property faces South with a 30m rear garden. The proposal in this application would not therefore impact the amenity of the property at 34 The Mall. The existing boundary wall and vegetation have set an established privacy boundary behind which is an unrestricted south facing aspect which will have no incursion by the proposed extension.

## **10. Compliance with Planning Policy**

The main issues would be are the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings in the area and indeed the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

There is no conflict with the objectives of Enfield Core Strategy or Development Management Document policies or the National Planning Policy Framework and indeed Permitted Development Rights for Householders.

The requirement is for development to have regard to the form, function and structure of an area and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. These concerns are acknowledged in that the architecture should make a positive contribution to the public realm and streetscape.

Adopted Policies require development proposals to, among other matters, to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches.

The living conditions of the adjoining property would not be affected given the lowered roof and parapet of the extension and the adjoining boundary with 34 The Mall. In terms of policy the proposal would have very little impact on the amenity or visual amenity of the adjoining or surrounding property.

Considering the planning balance of the scheme, the benefits of the scheme to the design and living conditions of the property are considered to have been taken into account. It is therefore concluded the scheme complies sufficiently with the development plan and national policy requirements.

## **11. Conclusion**

The proposed rear extension and alterations will preserve and enhance this property within the general area of The Mall in accordance with policy DMD8 & CP30.

Given the surrounding land-uses and the relationship to the immediate neighbours, it is considered the extension to the rear infill outrigger would not appear out-of-place nor

detrimental to the appearance of the street-scene. As such, there is no conflict with relevant national and local planning policies and it is therefore respectfully requested the application be granted Planning Consent.

There are no trees to be removed as a result of this proposal.

Access arrangements comply with Part 'M' of the building regulations. These do not however form part of this application.