LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 01/09/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/2060 **Ward:** Noel Park

Date received: 09/07/2015

Last amended date: n/a

Drawing number of plans: LDP/335: 01/A, 02/A,03A, 04A, 05A, /06/B

Address: 85 Mayes Road N22 6UP

Proposal: Erection of a Rear Dormer

Applicant: Mr B Idrizi

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Eoin Concannon

1. 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

Informatives:

1) Land ownership
1) Hours of construction
2) Party Wall Act

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

2.1 This is an application for the erection of a rear dormer extension. The roof conversion would involve improving the existing loft flat by creating greater outlook and daylight to the room.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is situated on the southern side of Mayer Road to the west of the Duke of Edinburgh Public House. The subject property is a two semi-detached Victorian period style property which has been converted to five flats. Planning

permission had previously been secured in 2007 for a dormer extension and conversion to 4 flats however this permission was not implemented.

2.3 The area has a mixture of residential properties including post war maisonettes style properties directly opposite the site. The property is not listed or within a designated area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

Planning	HGY/1992/1300	GTD	22-12-92	85 Mayes Road London	Construction of a crossover to a classified road.
Wizard	**Reference Number**	**Decision**	**Decision Date**	**Address**	**Notes**
Planning	HGY/2007/1439	GTD	16-10-07	85 Mayes Road Wood Green London	Loft conversion and conversion of property to 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed flats
Wizard	**Reference Number**	**Decision**	**Decision Date**	**Address**	**Notes**
Planning	HGY/2014/1803	GTD	18-08-14	85 Mayes Road London	Certificate of Lawfulness for use of property as five self contained flats.
Wizard	**Reference Number**	**Decision**	**Decision Date**	**Address**	**Notes**
Planning	HGY/2015/2060	PENDING	---	Flat E 85 Mayes Road London	Erection of a Rear Dormer
Wizard	**Reference Number**	**Decision**	**Decision Date**	**Address**	**Notes**
Planning	OLD/1985/0753	GTD	11-06-85	85 Mayes Road London	26/3/85 Conversion into two self-contained flats.
Wizard	**Reference Number**	**Decision**	**Decision Date**	**Address**	**Notes**
Planning	OLD/1986/0823	GTD	22-10-86	85 Mayes Road London	6/6/86 Erection of single storey extension at rear and a two storey side extension.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- No internal or external consultees.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of letters to adjoining households 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:
Objecting:0
Supporting:0

5.1 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

5.2 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- None

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

- The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

Character and appearance of the surrounding area

6.1 Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and Policy UD3 of the Haringey UDP require development proposals to be of high design quality, complement the character of the locality and are of a nature and scale that is sensitive to the surrounding area. SPG1a also 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.

6.1 Design Guidance SPG 1a also states that dormers should be subordinate to the roof; be In keeping with the character, size and scale of the building as a whole; be set well within the slope of the roof, away from the eaves and ridge.

6.2 The dormer would be set in from eaves, ridge and sides. The existing outrigger would also partially screen from the private realm. In general the design would appear subordinate within the roof slope. Whilst the windows would have more horizontal emphasis, given that that the flat is lawful, the additional light from the larger window would represent an improvement to the living standards of future occupiers of the unit.

6.3 As such, it is considered that the scale and proportions of the dormer extension are acceptable given its non-designated location and position to the rear.

6.4 As such the proposal is considered to comply with policies 7.4, 7.6 of the London Plan, SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan and Saved UDP Policy UD3 'General Principles' reinforce this strategic approach.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.5 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, aspect noise, pollution and of fume and smell nuisance.

6.6 There would be no detrimental impact on neighbours' amenity. The existing property has a large rear garden and does not directly abut any neighbouring properties to the rear. There would therefore be no overlooking, loss of light or outlook concerns. It would therefore be acceptable from an amenity perspective.

6.7 Conclusions

- Overall the rear dormer would retain a subordinate appearance in the roof slope and would not cause any amenity issues to adjoining neighbouring properties and would improve the living standards of the existing studio. It is therefore considered acceptable and recommended for approval.

- 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 Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Registered No. HGY/2015/2060

Applicant's drawing No.(s)

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
   LDP/335: 01/A, 02/A,03A, 04A, 05A, /06/B

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

INFORMATIVE: Land OwnershipThe applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall ActThe applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996

which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.