LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 13/04/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/0535 **Ward:** Seven Sisters

Date received: 23/02/2015

Drawing number of plans: 20150205-PL01, 02, 03, 07, 08 & 09

Address: 160 Gladesmore Road N15 6TH

Proposal: Addition of a first floor extension above the existing ground floor rear extension, extending 2.95m (householder application)

Applicant: Ms Rottenberg

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 01/04/2015

Officer contact: Anthony Traub

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

REASON 1: The proposal, by reason of its depth, height, massing, bulk, design, appearance, would result in an incongruous, dominant and visually unsympathetic extension that would harm the appearance of the building and terrace it forms part of, the visual amenity of the street scene and wider area generally. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the NPPF, saved UDP Policy UD3, London Plan Policy 7.8 and Local Plan Policy SP11.

REASON 2: The proposal, by reason of its depth, 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, daylight/sunlight 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

Addition of a first floor extension above the existing ground floor rear extension, extending 2.95m (householder application).

3.2 Site and Surroundings

The subject building is a two storey mid terraced dwellinghouse.

The building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

The surrounding area is residential.

3.3 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/1997/1108 GTD 26-08-97 Erection of a single storey side/rear extension.

HGY/2015/0537 PENDING --- Formation of Type 3 roof extension (householder application)

HGY/2015/0541 PN NOT REQ 30-03-15 Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- Adjoining neighbours.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 No representations 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

The proposed first floor rear extension is considered to be unacceptable for the following reasons:

- The proposal is incongruous and is at odds with the pattern of development in the immediate terrace and surrounding townscape given there are no additions of this type to neighbouring buildings;
- The design, appearance and massing of the proposal is unacceptable. The proposal appears as a two storey, full width extension that completely dominates the rear elevation of the building and in no way appears subservient or complementary to the existing building or terrace it forms part of.

The proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable and harmful to the appearance of the building, terrace, and wider townscape and is considered to be contrary to the 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 by occupants of adjacent residential properties as set out within saved UDP 2006 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6.

The proposal extends 2.95 from the rear building line at first floor level. This is likely to contravene the 45 degree BRE guidance for buildings and extensions and to harm the amount of daylight and sunlight to adjoining neighbour's windows. Furthermore, the outlook from these upper floor windows would be harmed by the deep extension leading to increasing sense of enclosure.

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.

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/2015/0535

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 20150205-PL01, 02, 03, 07, 08 & 09

For the following reasons:

REASON 1: The proposal, by reason of its depth, height, massing, bulk, design, appearance, would result in an incongruous, dominant and visually unsympathetic extension that would harm the appearance of the building and terrace it forms part of, the visual amenity of the street scene and wider area generally. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the NPPF, saved UDP Policy UD3, London Plan Policy 7.8 and Local Plan Policy SP11.

REASON 2: The proposal, by reason of its depth, 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,

daylight/sunlight 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.