LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 19/01/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2014/3371 **Ward:** Seven Sisters

Date received: 27/11/2014

Drawing number of plans: 14-1148-01a.

Address: 69 Vartry Road N15 6PS

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension

Applicant: Mr Benny Hoffman Fastgrand Ltd

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 20/01/2015

Officer contact: Anthony Traub

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

REASON: The proposal, by reason of its bulk, massing, siting and proximity with neighbouring properties would result in an overbearing and dominant development that would give rise to an increase sense of enclosure and a loss of outlook to the detriment of the living amenity of adjacent residents. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

Erection of a single storey rear extension

3.2 Site and Surroundings

The subject building is a mid terrace, two storey building divided into two flats. The building is not listed nor is it located in a conservation area.

The surrounding area is residential in nature.

3.3 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

None.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- Adjoining neighbours;
- Ward Councillors.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 No representations have been received.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.2 Design and appearance

SPG1a states that extensions or alterations to buildings should be subordinate in scale to the original building and should respect its architectural character. The development should not dominate existing features important to the building.

The proposal, whilst long, would still appear subservient to the existing building. Materials would also match that used on the existing building, which could be secured by way of condition were the scheme considered to be acceptable.

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable from a design and appearance view and in general accordance with NPPF, saved UDP Policy UD3, London Plan Policy 7.8 and Local Plan Policy SP11.

6.3 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

All development proposals are expected to maintain and respect the living conditions currently enjoyed occupants of adjacent residential properties as set out within saved UDP 2006 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6.

The subject property is a long and narrow property by virtue of the way the building is subdivided vertically. The proposal seeks to leave a small light well and enclose the majority of the space between the existing 2 storey outrigger and the boundary with the eastern neighbour.

The proposal would appear to this eastern neighbour (67 Vartry Road) as a deep blank wall measuring 3m in height and would appear to extend to a depth of 11.2m from the rear wall of the existing building. This form of extension, given its close proximity to the ground floor habitable room window of the neighbour, would enclose this space and cause harm to the outlook and sense of openness currently enjoyed by this neighbour.

Daylight/sunlight is not considered to be discernibly altered given the orientation of the site and that the ground floor habitable room window of the neighbour is already heavily shadowed by the two storey outrigger on site.

The privacy of neighbours is not considered to be harmed given the rear extension would overlook the rear garden or the internal courtyard created by the extension. These areas are screened by high garden walls.

Overall, the rear extension would result the significant loss of general outlook and create a long, blank wall that would enclose ground floor habitable room windows of the neighbour to the east, and thereby be overbearing from this neighbouring property.

6.4 Conclusions

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

7. CIL APPLICABLE

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Major or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2014/3371

Applicant's drawing No.s: 14-1148-01a.

For the following reason:

REASON: The proposal, by reason of its bulk, massing, siting and proximity with neighbouring properties would result in an overbearing and dominant development that would give rise to an increase sense of enclosure and a loss of outlook to the detriment of the living amenity of adjacent residents. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.