LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 16/03/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/0195 **Ward:** Stroud Green

Date received: 20/01/2015

Drawing number of plans: 2011-479/100 & 101

Address: 59 Mayfield Road N8 9LL

Proposal: Formation of loft conversion to first floor outrigger

Applicant: Mr Andrew Storey

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 02/02/2015

Officer contact: Aaron Lau

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) Design and appearance
2) Loss of amenity

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

- This is an application for Formation of loft conversion to first floor outrigger

3.2 Site and Surroundings

- The application site is rectangular in shape and comprises a two-storey terraced property located on the south western side of Mayfield Road.

- The siet does not fall within a designated conservation area.

3.3 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- HGY/2000/0952 - Certificate of lawfulness for use of property as two self contained flats. – approved 11/04/2000

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- No consultees

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 0 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 9 letters

5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 2
Objecting: 2
Supporting: 0

5.3 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Design and size of proposal
- Loss of light, outlook and privacy
- Increase parking (Officer Comment: There is no evidence to suggest that the additional bedroom would have a significant impact on existing parking conditions)

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.2 Character and appearance of the area

6.2.1 SPG1a 'Design guidance' 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.

6.2.2 This planning application concerns a maisonette unit occupying the first and second (loft) floors of the building. The loft has been previously converted with a rear dormer extension.

6.2.3 The proposal is for a roof addition with external terrace over the existing two-storey rear outrigger. The extension will have a flat roof design and measure 4.93m in depth, 3.3m in width and 2.95m in height.

6.2.4 There are several roof additions within the terrace, but they are smaller than the proposed development, and in any case, they cannot be considered as precedents as there is no planning history for them. Officers take the view that the second floor

addition, by virtue of its excessive massing and bulk as well as being prominent, would be a visual discordant and incongruous feature within the rear streetscape of this part of Mayfield Road. The proposed development would therefore unduly detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the area and thereby be contrary to Chapter 7 of the NPPF, saved UDP Policy UD3, London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6, Local Plan Policy SP11 and SPG 1a 'Design guidance'.

6.3 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.3.1 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 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan Policy 7.6.

6.3.2 Local representations regarding loss of amenity have been received following consultation.

6.3.3 The rear dormer extension forming part of a habitable room and belonging to the neighbouring property at No. 57 Mayfield Road currently enjoys uninterrupted short and long distance views. This outlook and the existing levels of daylight/sunlight would be severely compromised by the siting and scale of the proposed development. In addition, the new roof terrace would lead to a significant degree of loss of privacy of surrounding properties. As such, the proposal would be prejudicial to the general amenity of the occupiers residing in the vicinity, and would go against the presumption of UDP Policy UD3 and London Plan Policy 7.6, which among other things, aim to safeguard the amenity of local residents.

6.4 Conclusions

6.4.1 The proposed roof extension would introduce a discordant feature to the elevations of the building detracting from the visual appearance of the property and is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area by reason of the excessive depth and bulk of the extension in relation to the property.

6.4.2 The proposed development would have a seriously adverse effect of the amenity of neighbouring residents by reason of a material loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook and privacy.

6.4.3 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/2015/0195

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 2011-479/100,101

For the following reasons:

1. The proposed roof extension would introduce a discordant feature to the elevations of the building detracting from the visual appearance of the property and is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area by reason of the excessive depth and bulk of the extension contrary to Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011.

2. The proposed development would have a seriously adverse effect of the amenity of neighbouring residents by reason of a material loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook and privacy contrary to Policies 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.