LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 03/07/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/1425 **Ward:** Woodside

Date received: 13/05/2015

Last amended date: N/a

Drawing number of plans: 122-EX-LOC-001, 122-EX-SIT-002, 122-EX-PLN-003, 122-EX-ELE-004, 122-EX-ELE-005, 122-GA-SIT-006, 122-GA-PLN-007, 122-GA-ELE-008, 122-GA-ELE-009.

Address: Fylan Terrace Crofts Lane N22 5DQ

Proposal: Erection of 1 x two storey, one bedroom house, with rear garden

Applicant: Mr Dariusz Rytelewski

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 11/06/2015

Officer contact: Samuel Uff

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for a new one bedroom dwelling attached to the side of no.6 Fylan Terrace. The dwelling would be served by a ground floor rear extension, with first floor balcony, and a further conservatory beyond. The dwelling would have a narrow frontage, which would widen to the rear, following the angle of the site. The garden serving no.6 would be subdivided to provide amenity space to the rear. Refuse storage would be housed in an enclosure at the front of the site and cycle storage would be to the rear.

3.2 The proposed dwelling would be set back from the frontage by approximately 1m at ground floor and an additional 1m at first floor level. The frontage would have a narrow width of 1.4m and the ground floor would project 1.1m beyond the host building, at a width of 6.5m. A 1.4m deep conservatory would be added beyond and the full width rear projection would have a balcony and screening above.

3.3 The ground floor would be of a slate blue colour brick, with the top part of the building in oak panelling. The entrance would be oak framed and upper floor patio doors would be of a similar style.

Site and Surroundings

3.4 The relevant part of the site is the side to rear garden of no.6 Fylan Terrace, which is an end of terrace dwelling. The site has an angled boundary, which is narrow at the front, with a front gate, and wider toward the rear. The terrace of Fylan Terrace has a symmetrical design with three pairs of attached dwellings forming a terrace. Immediately to the west there is a triangle of what appears to be highway maintained land. Beyond this is the car port and dwelling at no.1 Crofts Lane, which forms the start of another distinctive terrace. Opposite the site is the St Thomas More Catholic School. The site is not within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.5 None relevant.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal:

1) LBH Transportation Team: PTAL 2. Likely to require private vehicle use in this area, but the site is not identified as suffering high on-street parking pressure. Modest size of the house would mean the increase in parking demand not significant. The new dwelling would need a street number.

2) LBH Waste Team: No objection to the siting of the refuse.

External:

None required.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 6 letters. 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: 1
Supporting: 0
Neither: 1

5.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None.

5.3 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- Cllr Ann Waters.

5.4 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:

- Balcony is out of keeping.
- Issues of overlooking from large windows / balcony.
- Loss of amenity (to the rear).
- Obtrusive infill of the space.
- Overdevelopment of the site.

5.5 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Issues of building works

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. The impact of the proposed development on the host dwelling and within context of the wider streetscene;
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
3. Living conditions for future occupants;
4. Parking and highway safety;

6.1 Design and impact on the streetscene

6.1.1 London Plan Policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' require development proposals to be of the highest design quality and have appropriate regard to local context. Haringey Local Plan Policies SP11 and SP12, as well as Saved UDP Policy UD3 'General Principles' continue this approach. SPG1a 'Design guidance' goes on to state 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.

6.1.2 Saved Policy UD3 specifically states that developments should *"demonstrate that the proposal complements the character of the local area and is of a nature and scale that is sensitive to the surrounding area".* The proposed new dwelling would be of a very distinct style within the context of the site and both neighbouring terraces. Whilst this in and of itself is not necessarily a negative, it does increase the importance on quality design. In this instance it is considered that the site restrictions, notably the narrow frontage and angled side boundary, would result in a development of cramped appearance, with an undesirable flank wall, which would constitute a negative addition to the streetscene.

6.1.3 The space between the distinctive terraces is considered to be desirable within the streetscene that provides a relief between the two sets of terraces. The angle of the flank wall of the proposal would give this an awkward appearance out of character with the parallel terraced housing and school building opposite. Furthermore, the narrow frontage would be out of character with the wide dwelling design in the rest

of the streetscene. The distinctive materials would further emphasise this uncharacteristic relationship.

6.1.4 Whilst a contemporary design may create a positive addition in some streetscenes it should still respect important features within. In this instance the proposed dwelling would appear as a totally alien feature within the streetscene, with a cramped appearance, to the detriment of the streetscene. Furthermore, the proposed refuse enclosure is considered to be unnecessary and standard refuse arrangements as per the other dwellings in this street would suffice.

6.1.5 To the rear of the site the host terrace has a slight stepped appearance but this is not as significant as the additional metre depth proposed at ground floor level in this instance. Furthermore, the 6.5m wide balcony would add to the prominence of this building when viewed from neighbouring gardens, including those to the rear on Woodside Road.

6.1.6 Accordingly it is recommended that the application be refused on design impact and a negative impact within the streetscene.

6.2 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.2.1 Saved UDP 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 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.

6.2.2 The applicant has demonstrated a 45-degree angle from the furthest projection of the single storey rear projection and balcony above. The closest part of this neighbour's site is the car port, with the closest window approximately 4.5m from the boundary. Whilst the 3m projection of the single storey rear projection beyond the main rear elevation of the dwelling would generally be considered to be acceptable the angled flank wall following the line of the boundary would add an increased sense of enclosure in this instance.

6.2.3 Furthermore, the projection of the balcony beyond the main rear elevation would create an increased sense of overlooking to the dwellings within this terrace and the perception of privacy of residents private gardens. In an area of predominantly family dwellings it is considered that this overlooking would be more significant, especially given the prominence of this feature, in an area that does not have other high level amenity areas.

6.2.4 There have been objections from the rear regarding a loss of daylight and sunlight from the infilling of the gap. Whilst there may be some loss of a view from the partial closing of the gap between the terraces the relationship is not considered to be significantly worse than that between the previously developed. The separation of approximately 20 metres would be marginally less the size of the dwelling would be less. Whilst the perception of overlooking and loss of privacy may apply to these neighbours to the rear, there is not considered to be a loss of daylight or sunlight.

6.3 Living conditions for future occupants

6.3.1 London Plan 2011 Policy 3.5 and accompanying London Housing Design Guide set out the space standards for all new residential developments to ensure an acceptable level of living accommodation offered.

6.3.2 The 54sqm internal floor area of the proposed one bed dwelling would comply with the required 50sqm floor area for a dwelling of this size. The proposed rear garden amenity space would be significant for a dwelling of this size. The main living space would have limited light from the southern elevation, due to the narrow frontage, but the rear conservatory would provide daylight to the rear. It is noted that if the proposal were considered acceptable then considered windows could be installed in the angled flank elevation.

6.4 Parking and highway safety

6.4.1 The application site has a low PTAL level of 2, therefore there is a high likelihood that prospective residents of this development would use a private vehicle for journeys to and from the application site. However, the site does not fall within an area that has been identified within the Councils adopted Unitary Development Plan as that suffering from high on-street parking pressure. As such the small size of the dwelling would not significantly impact on parking.

Conclusions

- The proposed siting of the site, with narrow frontage and angled flank wall, out of keeping with the surrounding terraces and creating an undesirable cramped appearance. The projection and insertion of a rear balcony would create an undesirable sense of enclosure and loss of privacy.

- All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

7. CIL APPLICABLE

- Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge would be £1,890 and the Haringey CIL charge will be £14,310 (54sqm x £265). This would be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2015/1317

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 1409.EX.51 - 9 incl. and 1409.PL.01 - 9 incl.

Subject to the following condition(s)/For the following reason(s)

1. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its design, scale, narrow front elevation, siting, angled flank elevation beyond the rear of the existing dwelling and design details, would be out of keeping with the design and character of the existing dwelling and streetscene as a whole and create a cramped appearance in this previously open area, 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 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1A.

2. The proposed first floor balcony would be a prominent and incongruous feature, causing overlooking and a significant loss of privacy to the surrounding dwellings. Additionally the height of this feature and any additional height of screening in conjunction with the angled siting along the boundary, projecting beyond the rear of no.1 Crofts Lane, the development would constitute an imposing presence and cause a significant sense of enclosure to this neighbour. As such the proposed development would be 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 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1A.

3. The proposed refuse enclosure in front of the site would be out of character with the style of refuse storage in the vicinity and create visual clutter in this frontage 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 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1A.