LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 23/03/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/0232 **Ward:** Seven Sisters

Date received: 26/01/2015

Drawing number of plans: 15/174/01, 15/174/02, 15/174/03

Address: 41A St Anns Road N15 6NG

Proposal: Subdivision of existing flat to form an additional one bed flat

Applicant: Mr C Callisto

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 18/03/2015

Officer contact: Anthony Traub

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reason for Refusal:

REASON: The proposal would provide substandard and cramped living conditions for future occupiers of the development resulting in a poor quality of residential accommodation. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and inconsistent with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1A and its Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

Subdivision of existing flat to form an additional one bed flat.

3.2 Site and Surroundings

The subject building is an end of terrace two storey building divided into flats. The proposal relates to the flat on the first floor.

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

HGY/2002/0599 GTD 25-06-02 Proposed loft conversion and erection of conservatory to rear of existing roof.

HGY/2002/1246 GTD 22-10-02 London Amendment to Condition 3 attached to permission HGY/2002/0599 to allow the raising of the party wall by 800mm

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- Adjoining neighbours;
- Ward Councillors;
- LBH Housing;
- LBH Cleansing;
- LBH Transportation;
- Network Rail;
- London Fire Brigade; and
- Thames Water.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The following representations have been received:

- Network Rail: No objection to the proposal;
- Thames Water: No objection to the proposal;
- LBH Cleansing: RAG status of Red. Details needed for waste storage on site.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Principle of the development
2. Design and appearance
3. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
4. Living conditions for future occupants
5. Parking and highway safety

6.2 Principle of the development

Local Plan Policy SP0 supports the broad vision of the NPPF, and states that the Council will take a positive approach to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Permission will be granted by the Council unless any benefits are significantly outweighed by demonstrable harm caused by the proposal.

The NPPF, London Plan Policy 3.3 and Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP2 seek to maximise the supply of additional housing to meet future demand in the borough and London in general. The proposal is for the creation of two residential flats from one. The principle of introducing an additional residential unit at the site would be supported by the Council in augmenting housing stock in the rear, and in meeting the intent of the NPPF, London Plan

Policy 3.3 and Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP2, albeit all other material planning considerations are to be met.

6.3 Design and appearance

The proposal would not involve any external work and therefore, there would be no impact on the appearance of the existing building.

6.4 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

Saved UDP Policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, overlooking. Similarly London Plan Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy.

The proposal would not involve any external work and therefore, there would be no impact on the amenities of adjoining neighbours.

There are three windows internal to the site that may provide vantage points to each of the proposed flats at close proximity. This could easily be overcome through condition by requiring obscured glazing to one of the two bedroom windows nearest he kitchen to protect the privacy of future occupiers.

6.5 Living conditions for future occupiers

London Plan Policy 3.5 and accompanying London Housing Design Guide set out the space standards for all new residential developments to ensure an acceptable level of living accommodation offered.

In assessing the proposal against these requirements, the flats would fail to accord with the minimum unit size requirements.

The minimum standards prescribed for individual rooms are set out within The London Housing Design Guide. Again, bedroom 1 of the one bed flat and bedroom 2 of the two bed flat both fall well short of the required room sizes.

The proposal is therefore considered to provide substandard and cramped living conditions for future occupiers of the development resulting in a poor quality of residential accommodation. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and inconsistent with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1A and its Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

6.6 Parking and highway safety

The site has a PTAL rating of 6a which represents very good access to sustainable local public transport services including Wood Green tube station and a number of bus routes. The site does not lie within an area that has been identified to suffer from significant parking stress. Appendix 1 of the Haringey UDP sets a maximum number of car parking

for flatted development: 1 space per 2 or more bedroom unit. However, each case needs to be assessed on an individual basis.

The proposal makes no provision for off-street parking. It should be noted however that the site has very good accessibility, and the surrounding roads do not suffer from any significant parking stress. The provision of cycle storage would be expected and could be conditioned to justify the parking shortfall and also promote a sustainable mode of travel over the private motor vehicles in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.9 and Local Plan Policy SP7. The car-free development is therefore deemed acceptable under these circumstances.

6.7 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

There would be no 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/2015/0232

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 15/174/01, 15/174/02, 15/174/03

For the following reason:

REASON: The proposal would provide substandard and cramped living conditions for future occupiers of the development resulting in a poor quality of residential accommodation. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and inconsistent with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1A and its Housing Supplementary Planning Document.