## LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

## 1. APPLICATION DETAILS

**Reference No:** HGY/2015/0259 **Ward:** Seven Sisters

**Date received:** 27/01/2015

**Last amended date:** DD/MM/YYYY

**Drawing number of plans:** 20141291 PL05, 06 ,01, 02, 03, 04

**Address:** 38 Clifton Gardens N15 6AP

**Proposal:** Extension to the rear of the first floor, extending 3 metres over the existing ground floor extension (householder application)

**Applicant**: Clifton Estates Ltd.

**Ownership:** Private

**Site Visit Date:**

**Officer contact:** Malachy McGovern

## 2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

## 3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

### Proposed development

The application seeks planning permission for construction of an extension to the rear of the first floor, extending 3 metres over the existing ground floor extension (householder application)

### Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a two storey, mid-terrace house located on the southern side of Clifton Gardens. The property already benefits from a ground floor rear extension. Many of the properties in the street have similar extensions and have been altered significantly.

The property is not a Listed Building and is not located within a Conservation Area. The surrounding area is residential in nature and characterised by terraces of similar properties.

### Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

No relevant planning history

## 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

7 Neighbour Letters

No responses received

## 5 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development;
2. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
3. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
4. Living conditions for future occupants;
5. Sustainability

### 6.1 Principle of the development

The principle of extending a residential property is generally supported by policy and accepted in principle. The NPPF places a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

### 6.2 Design and appearance

Local Plan (2013) Policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. Development shall be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity which is supported by London Plan (2016) Policies 7.4 and 7.6. Draft DM Policy (2015) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' continues this approach and requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality.

The proposal involves construction of a full width (5.8 metre), first floor extension above the existing 4 metres deep ground floor rear extension. The addition would have a depth of 3 metres and would rise to a maximum height of 2.8 metres with a flat roof.
The submitted drawings indicate that the proposed rear extension would have a flat roof which would sit just below eaves level of the main building. The addition would therefore relate poorly to the architectural conventions of the original pitched roof dwelling and the terrace of which it forms a part. The resultant extensions at ground and first floor would appear as excessively bulky, and utilitarian and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

Whilst it is noted that the neighbouring property to the east (no. 40) has a 2/3 width first floor rear extension with a flat roof in addition to front and rear box dormers, this is not regarded to be a benchmark of acceptability given there is no record of planning permission having been granted for the first floor element. The presence of unsympathetic

alterations and extensions within the terrace is not considered to provide justification for further erosion of architectural quality and harm to the area.

The proposed extension by reason of its size, bulky design, unsympathetic roof form and position is unacceptable in design terms.

### 6.3 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

The London Plan (2016) Policy 7.6 *Architecture* states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. UDP (2006) Saved Policy UD3 also requires development not to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight, or sunlight, privacy overlooking, aspect noise, pollution and of fume and smell nuisance. Draft DM Policy (2015) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' continues this approach and requires developments to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for its users and neighbours.

The submitted drawings indicate that the first floor extension would be full width and would have a depth of 3 metres. It is noted that the neighbouring property no. 40 to the east has a 2/3 width rear extension and as such would have rear facing windows that would be 'boxed in' by the proposal. The result would be an unacceptable loss of light and outlook from the first floor windows of no. 40. Additionally, the proposed 3 metres depth would appear as an overbearing addition when viewed from the rear of no. 36 (immediately west). The proposal would reduce available light and outlook, and would increase the sense of enclosure from the first floor rear facing windows of no. 36 to a harmful degree.

The proposal is unacceptable therefore in amenity terms.

### 6.4 Sustainability

No information has been provided with regard to sustainability and there is no indication that sustainable design, construction or materials have been considered by the applicant.

### 6.5 Conclusions

- All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be grefused 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 Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

## 8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2015/0259

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 20141291.PL05,06,01,02,03,04

For the following reason(s)

The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its size, scale and unsympathetic roof form, would be excessively bulky and out of keeping with the design and character of the existing dwelling and would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the property and the visual amenity of the area as a whole, contrary to and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

The proposed extension would reduce the available light and outlook from the first floor rear facing windows of no. 36 and no. 40 to an unacceptable degree and as such would be harmful to the living conditions of existing occupiers contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.