LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 23/03/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/0278 **Ward:** Stroud Green

Date received: 28/01/2015

Last amended date: DD/MM/YYYY

Drawing number of plans: 001 and 001A

Address: Flat A 66 Florence Road N4 4DP

Proposal: Construction of a conservatory in the rear side return

Applicant: Mrs Donna Ferguson

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 03/03/2015

Officer contact: Malachy McGovern

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

2.1 Proposed development

Construction of a conservatory in the rear side return

2.2 Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises three storey end-of-terrace property located on the south western side of Florence Road at the junction with Lorne Road

The property already benefits from a single storey extension which spans the entire depth of the garden as a form of ‘connecting corridor’ with the single storey garage at the bottom of the rear garden.

The property is not a Listed Building however is located within the Stroud Green Conservation Area

2.3 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

Planning HGY/2010/1667 GTD 14-12-10 Ground Floor Flat, 66 Florence Road London Demolition of boundary fence / garage and erection of single storey rear extension with garage to rear and storage cupboards to side.

Planning HGY/2011/0423 GTD 04-04-11 Flat A 66 Florence Road London Approval of Details pursuant to Condition 4 (materials) attached to planning permission HGY/2010/1667

Planning HGY/2011/0803 GTD 24-05-11 66 Florence Road London Application for non-material amendments following a grant of planning permission HGY/2010/1667 to insert a window in a garage

Planning HGY/2011/1762 GTD 15-11-11 Flat A, 66 Florence Road London Variation of condition 5 (garage accommodation) attached to planning permission HGY/2010/1667 to allow the garage to be used as living accommodation

Planning HGY/2015/0278 PENDING 00-00-00 Flat A 66 Florence Road London Construction of a conservatory in the rear side return

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4 Neighbour Letters

LBH Building Control
LBH Conservation Officer

Stroud Green CAAC
Stroud Green Residents Association

1 Objection was received from the Stroud Green CAAC on the following grounds:

- The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site
- The proposed extensions would result in poor internal layout

5 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning issues are considered to be:

- Principle of development;
- Design and impact on the Conservation Area;
- Impact on residential amenity

Principle of development;

The principle of extending a residential property to improve the existing residential accommodation is generally supported by policy and acceptable in principle subject to satisfying other policy objectives of the development plan.

Design & Impact on Conservation Area

Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (LP) (2011) requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (HLP) (2013) requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Saved policy CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) requires that alterations or extensions preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

The Council's SPG1a Design guidance states that all extensions should be of an appropriate scale and form, should be subordinate to the main building and should be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The Council's conservation policies seek to ensure that all developments preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The surrounding area is characterised by large semi-detached dwellings, many with proportionate ground floor rear extensions and additions and ample garden space.

The proposed extension by contrast, would in effect infill the 2.2 metre gap between the existing closet wing element and rear extension (approved under HGY/2010/1667) and the neighbouring boundary with no. 64 immediately east. The addition would have a depth of 3.96 metres and would be set forward from the rear building line by 1 metre. The resultant development would be excessive in terms of its overall bulk and depth and would fail to be subordinate to the scale and footprint of the original building. The cumulative bulk of the extensions would be completely out of character with the established residential character of the area and unacceptable in design terms.

The proposal is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of both the host building and wider conservation area is unacceptable in design terms.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6 Architecture states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. 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 and aspect.

It is noted that the proposed extension would have be constructed on the eastern side of the property adjacent to no. 64. Whilst the addition would cause some reduction in light and outlook it is not considered that this would be so significant so as to warrant refusal given the 2.1 metre eaves height. It is noted that a 2 metre boundary treatment could be constructed under permitted development.

Other:

The cumulative impact of the extensions would reduce the available outdoor amenity space for the family unit to an unacceptable degree and would represent overdevelopment of the site.

6.1 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/2015/0278

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 001 and 001A

For the following reason(s)

The proposed development by reason of its poor design, excessive depth and bulk would fail to be sufficiently subordinate to the original building and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host builidng and wider Conservation Area. The proposal would also result in overdevelopment in relation to the area of the site, the size of the property itself, and those in the immediate vicinity. The proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the original building and wider Conservation Area in general contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2011, Saved Policies CSV12 and UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, and Policy SP11 & SP12 of the Haringey Core Strategy 2012

The proposed development would result in substandard provision of external amenity space for the 3 bedroom family sized unit detrimental to the living conditions of its occupants, 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.