LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 20/05/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/0917 **Ward:** Fortis Green

Date received: 30/03/2015

Last amended date: N/A

Drawing number of plans: Design and Access Statement, Proposed Top Foor Plan, Proposed Roof Section, Proposed Roof Plan, Proposed Rear Elevation, Proposed Front Elevation, Location and Site Plan, Existing Top Floor Plan, Existing Roof Section A-A, Existing Roof Plan, Existing Rear Elevation, Existing Front Elevation

Address: Primrose House 22 Leaside Avenue N10 3BU

Proposal: Refurbishment of loft conversion, erection of rear dormer window, replacement of front skylight window and addition of 2 new front skylights (householder application)

Applicant: Mr James West

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 27/02/2015

Officer contact: Tobias Finlayson

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Conditions
1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
2) In accordance with approved plans

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

The application is for refurbishment of loft conversion, erection of rear dormer window, replacement of front skylight window and addition of 2 new front skylights (householder application).

3.2 Site and surroundings

The application site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace property located on the eastern of Leaside Avenue. The property is not a listed building however is located within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

The surrounding area is residential.

3.3 Relevant planning and enforcement history for the site

2015: Planning application (ref: HGY/2015/0057)refused for refurbishment of loft conversion, erection of front and rear dormer window and replacement of front skylight window.

2002: Planning permission (ref: HGY/2002/1572) granted for change of use from elderly persons accommodation to single family house.

August 1997: Planning application (ref: HGY/1997/0583) refused for retention of one velux window is rear roof slope.

January 1997: Planning application (ref: HGY/1996/1606) refused for formation of residential accommodation in roof space involving erection of rear dormer window.

4. CONSULTATION

The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Conservation Officer
- Muswell Hill/Fortis Green/Rookfield CAAC
- Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Residents Association

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 14 letters to neighbouring properties and the local MP.

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: 5
Objecting:
Supporting: 1
Neither: 4

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Muswell Hill/Fortis Green/Rookfield CAAC

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:

- Proposal has removed the front dormer which was the reason for objection and rejection of the last application
- Use of rooflights not inappropriate or detrimental to the architecture and design of the Fortis Green conservation area.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the conservation area; and

2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.1 Character and appearance of the conservation area

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The importance of properly discharging the duty conferred by these provisions and the need to pay particular attention to potential harm was recently underlined by the decision of the courts in the Barnwell Manor case.

Paragraph 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal. Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2015 seeks to ensure that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail. Similarly Local Plan policy 2013 SP12 seeks to ensure the conservation of heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment.

Subsequent to the refusal of the previous application (as noted above) the front dormer has been removed from the scheme proposed under the current application. The installation of the rooflights instead of the previously proposed front dormer is arguably permitted development and furthermore, there are a number of examples within the terrace and wider street and they are therefore considered acceptable.

The proposed rear dormer will provide appropriate margins and maintain sufficient roofslope so as to appear subservient to the host building and not as a top heavy addition that would dominate the roofslope. The proposed rear dormer is therefore considered acceptable.

Given the above, the proposal is acceptable and preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2015, saved policies CSV12 and UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and policy SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Core Strategy 2012.

6.2 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

Saved UDP 2006 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 2015 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.

It is not considered that the proposal would cause any material harm by way of overlooking and there would be no loss of light or outlook given the position of the additions at roof level within a terrace. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

6.3 Conclusions

The proposed development is acceptable as it would not adversely affect the residential amenity in terms of daylight/sunlight and outlook of neighbouring properties and will not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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 100sqm and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayor or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Registered No. HGY/2015/0917

Applicant's drawing No.(s) Design and Access Statement, Proposed Top Foor Plan, Proposed Roof Section, Proposed Roof Plan, Proposed Rear Elevation, Proposed Front Elevation, Location and Site Plan, Existing Top Floor Plan, Existing Roof Section A-A, Existing Roof Plan, Existing Rear Elevation, Existing Front Elevation

Subject to the following condition(s):

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and specifications:

Design and Access Statement, Proposed Top Foor Plan, Proposed Roof Section, Proposed Roof Plan, Proposed Rear Elevation, Proposed Front Elevation, Location and Site Plan, Existing Top Floor Plan, Existing Roof Section A-A, Existing Roof Plan, Existing Rear Elevation, Existing Front Elevation

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.