LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 14/09/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/2105 **Ward:** Northumberland Park

Date received: 21/07/2015

Last amended date:

Drawing number of plans: ELA/1 rev A, ELA/3 rev A, ELA/6 rev A and ELA/7 rev A

Address: 37 Baronet Road N17 0LY

Proposal: Erection of chalet bungalow in rear garden with entrance off Sutherland Road (Outline)

Applicant: Coral Humes

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Eoin Concannon

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1)

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

2.1 This application seeks outline permission for a chalet type dweling in rear garden with entrance off Sutherland Road. It would comprise a 2 bedroom unit with kitchen/living plus 1 bedroom on ground floor and a secondary carers bedroom on upper floor. No information on special circumstances have accompanied the application.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is situated to the north of Baronet Road with the existing rear gardens of Nos.37 and 39 with access onto Sutherland Road. The existing site contains a garage with access onto to Sutherland Road. The area is characterised

by terrace residential properties with large rear gardens. Many of these properties have impact large ground and first floor extensions.

2.3 The existing property or site is with any designated area or does not contain a listed structure.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- None

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

The following responses were received:

Internal:

1) LBH Transportation Team: No objection

1) Waste Management: No objections raised

External:

2) Thames Water: No response received.
3) London Fire Brigade: No objections strongly recommends installation of sprinklers

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of letters to adjoining properties. 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:

- Councillor Bevan raised the following concerns
  i) The property looks more like a house than a bungalow
  ii) Concern as to whether the development meet space standards
  iii) Concerned regarding the loss of light to neighbouring properties
  iv) Waste disposal issues
  v) There is an issue with the removal of a tree on the boundary.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development;
1. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
3. Living conditions for future occupants;
4. Parking and highway safety;
5. Trees;
6. Accessibility; and
7. Sustainability

6.1 Principle of the development

6.1 The principle of additional housing is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 chapter 6 Delivering a wide choice of quality homes, London Plan 2011 Policies 3.3 'Increasing Housing Supply' and 3.4 'Optimising Housing Potential'. It is also supported by Haringey Local Plan Policy SP2 'Housing'. The Haringey Local Plan 2013 sets out a target of 8,200 dwellings between 2011 and 2021 (820 per year). Under the proposed further alterations to the London plan (FALP), the 2015-2025 targets is proposed to increase to 15,019 (1,502 per year). In addition, the site is within a broader residential context.

6.2 The application site is within a residential land with no designated restrictions. The principal of the development would comply with the Council's housing policies subject to satisfying the remaining considerations of this report.

6.3 Character and appearance of the surrounding area

6.4 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. Local Plan Policy SP11 and Saved UDP Policy UD3 'General Principles' reinforce this strategic approach. The policies seek to enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. To achieve this all development shall be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity.

6.5 The proposal seeks permission for a backland development to the rear of Nos.37 and 39 Baronet Road which would access onto Sutherland Road. Currently the rear boundary contains a 2 metre high timber boarded fence and historic garage with parking situated on both sides Sutherland Road. This boundary treatment would

make way for the new dwelling with the front elevation set back approximately 2 metres from the front boundary. Whilst the overall design of the building would appear satisfactory due to the constraints of the site, it would have a negative impact on the surrounding area. The lack of set back would have a negative impact on the street scene with the dwelling having a cramped appearance along Sutherland Road. Similarly, the properties along Baronet Road generally have set characteristics with large double storey outriggers and medium size rear gardens that stretch approximately 16 metres in length. The erection of a dwelling to the rear of Nos.37 and 39 would erode into a large section area of garden space thereby detracting from the uniform arrangement of the rear gardens. Furthermore, the existing site has already a large single storey extension which projects a significant distance into the rear garden. The accumulation of development within the rear garden would lead to an overdevelopment of the site. As such the overall size, positioning and level of existing development on the site would have a negative impact on both the street scene along Sutherland Road and the uniform of the properties along Baronet Road. It would lead to an overdevelopment along the rear of the property and therefore contrary to policies 7.4, 7.6 of the Local Plan, SP11 Local Plan and Policy UD3 of the Saved UDP.

6.6 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.7 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.

6.8 The proposed dwelling would have a maximum height of 5 metres within 8 metres of the two storey outrigger. The single storey ground floor elements to the rear of these properties would be closer to the development. This distance would lead to a dominating/overbearing impact to the occupiers of Nos.37 and 39 due to the proximity of the development. Whilst no sectional drawings accompanied this outline application, the positioning of these roof lights projecting onto the rear gardens would lead to the perception of overlooking to the ground floor elements and given the lack of separation distance would have a detrimental impact on the neighbours' amenity. The proposal would not adversely impact the amenity of Nos. 50 and 61 Sutherland Road. Whilst in close position to both these properties, there would be no direct overlooking and impact on daylight/sunlight due to the site orientation.

6.9 Living conditions for future occupants

6.10 London Plan 2011 Policy 3.5 'Quality and Design of Housing Developments' requires the design of all new housing developments to enhance the quality of local places and for the dwelling in particular to be of sufficient size and quality. The standards by which this is measured are set out in the Mayor's Housing SPG 2012.

6.11 The residential unit would have a gross internal floorspace over 90 sq.m. and is in excess of the floorspace minima for a two-bedroom dwelling as set out in the Council's Housing SPD and the London Plan. The layout of the proposed units, ventilation and circulation space is considered adequate. The unit would be dual aspect with full width/height window serving the main living space. The quality of accommodation would also be appropriately built to Lifetime Homes Standards. The private amenity space is proposed side/ of the house would be below the standard 50 square metres and this development infringe on the existing amenity space serving No.37 and 39. .

6.12 Overall the internal standard of accommodation is considered acceptable and in line with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2011, the Mayor's Housing SPG and the Council's Housing SPD 2008.

6.13 Parking and highway safety

6.14 Local Plan (2013) Policy SP7 Transport states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport

6.15 The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted and advises that the site has moderate accessibility to public transport with a PTAL of 3. There are seven (7) bus routes within 8 minutes walk of the site. These bus routes have varying frequencies from 4 to 12 vehicles per hour. Northumberland Park Rail Station is approx. 602m (7.5 minutes' walk) from the site. Although the nearest LUL stations of Bruce Grove and White Hart Lane are outside of 12 minutes' walk from the site, these stations can be accessed directly by several of the bus routes that serve the site.

6.16 The adjoining streets are within a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and therefore are subject to parking controls. Baronet Road and adjoining streets are within the Tottenham Match Day CPZ with controls operating on match days Monday to Friday 5:00PM – 8:30PM, Saturday/Sunday and bank holidays from Noon (12PM) – 4:30PM.

6.17 The access to the property will be taken from Sutherland Road, which is to the rear of the existing property that shares the same plot at 37 Baronet Road. The access provision is considered satisfactory, but will require some highway improvement works to facilitate access to the property and to ensure a good interface with the public highway.

6.18 The development provides 2x cycle parking spaces. This provision meets the requirements of the London Plan (FALP 2015) – 1 per residential unit up to 45sqm and 2 per residential unit above 45sqm. Overall, the Highways Officer considered the proposal to be satisfactory, subject to the owner agreeing to pay the Council the

cost of any necessary highway improvements works to provide access to the property in Sutherland Road. No material traffic impacts will arise from this development. The additional demand for on-street car parking would be no more than 1 space, which is not expected to impact materially on the capacity of parking in the adjoining roads.

6.19 Trees

6.20 With regard to trees UDP (2006) Policy OS17 states that the Council will seek to protect and improve the contribution of trees, tree masses and spines to local landscape character by ensuring that, when unprotected trees are affected by development, a programme of tree replanting and replacement of at least equal amenity and ecological value and extent is approved by the Council.

6.21 Whilst historically there appears to have been a large mature street tree situated along Sutherland Road. This tree has been removed and given that it was outside the site boundary, it would be unreasonable to request replacement planting within the site. Due to the constraints of the site, limited landscaping could be secured by condition.

6.22 Accessibility

6.23 The layout and access to the site would be acceptable to all. A level entrance with level access with sufficient room to manoeuvre in and out of the property could be secured by condition. Illustrative furniture on the proposed plans shows sufficient space for those with difficulty. The dwelling provides a ground floor bedroom which would be suitable for those with disability.

6.24 As such the proposal provides acceptable access for all.

6.25 Sustainability

6.26 Chapter 5 of the London Plan 2011 sets out the approach to climate change and requires developments to make the fullest contribution to minimizing carbon dioxide emissions. The development has the potential to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4; this is equivalent to 25% reduction emissions over a Building Regulations 2010 baseline. A condition could be applied securing this.

6.27 Conclusions

- *Overall due to the constraints of the site, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would to lead to the overdevelopment of the site eroding into the rear gardens serving Nos.37/39. The lack of set back to the front would create a cramped appearance along Sutherland Road. The positioning of the development would create dominating*

development to the occupiers of Nos.37/39 Baronet Road whilst also given the perception of overlooking due to the developments close proximity. As such, it is therefore recommended for refusal.

- 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 will be £3273 (91sqm x £35) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1365 (91sqm x £265/165/15). This will 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. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2015/2105

Applicant's drawing No. (s) ELA/1 rev A, ELA/3 rev A, ELA/6 rev A and ELA/7 rev A

For the following reason(s)

1. The proposed development represents overdevelopment in relation to the area of the site and the properties in the locality contrary to Policies 3.4 and 3.5 of the London Plan 2011 and supporting guidance, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 by reason of:

(A) ... thereby causing demonstrable harm.
(A5) excessive site coverage and massing
(A6) excessive site coverage prejudicing the provision of adequate amenity space for the benefit of future occupants.
(A8) the creation of unnecessary problems of overlooking and loss of privacy to adjacent properties.
(A9) poor relationship to the existing pattern of development

2. The development would be visually intrusive when viewed from adjoining properties along Baronet Road by reason of its bulk, overall scale and massing giving rise to a poor level of outlook, sense of enclosure and overbearing impact on these neighbouring properties, thereby contrary to Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2013

The proposed development represents overdevelopment in relation to the area of the site and the properties in the locality thereby causing demonstrable harm by reason of excessive site coverage and massing, loss of adequate amenity space for the benefit of current and future occupants, the creation of unnecessary problems of overlooking and loss of privacy to adjacent properties and poor relationship to the existing pattern of development, contrary to Policies 3.4 and 3.5 of the London Plan 2011 and supporting guidance, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

The development would be visually intrusive when viewed from adjoining properties along Baronet Road by reason of its bulk, overall scale and massing giving rise to a poor level of outlook, sense of enclosure and overbearing impact on these neighbouring properties, thereby contrary to Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2013