LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 18/12/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/3210 **Ward:** Fortis Green

Date received: 29/10/2015

Drawing number of plans: AP(00)01 Rev P1; AP(00)02 Rev P1; AP(00)03 Rev P1; AP(00)04 Rev P1; AP(00)05 Rev P1; AP(00)06 Rev P1; AP(00)07 Rev P1; AP(00)08 Rev P1

Address: 83 Steeds Road N10 1JB

Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory extension and replacement with single storey rear extension. Loft conversion and chimney removal.

Applicant: Mr Zarig Cooper

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Adam Flynn

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) The proposed rear extension due to its combined height, depth and proximity to the boundary would result in an unduly harmful loss of residential amenity for the occupants of 81 Steed Road by way of an increased sense of dominance and enclosure contrary to Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 'saved policy' UD3 and London Plan 2015 policies 7.4 and 7.6.

2) The proposed roof dormer, by reason of its bulk, size and scale, would introduce a discordant feature to the rear elevation of the building detracting from the visual appearance of the property and are therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area by reason of excessive bulk, scale and massing in relation to the host property, 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 2015.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

This is an application for the demolition of existing conservatory extension and replacement with single storey rear extension. Loft conversion and chimney removal.

3.2 Site and Surroundings

The site is a two-storey terraced dwelling located on the western side of Steeds Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, and is made up of similar terraced dwellings.

3.3 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2010/2328 – Demolition of existing lean-to and erection of new rear conservatory (householder application) – Refused 08/02/2011

HGY/2011/0450 – Demolition of existing lean-to and erection new rear conservatory. (Household Application – Granted 03/05/2011

HGY/2014/1264 – Demolition of existing wooden porch and construction of brick built porch with double glazed fittings (householder application) – Granted 01/07/2014

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

No consultation required.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 4 letters.

5.2 No representations were received.

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 area
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.1 Character and appearance of the area

SPG1a 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.

The rear dormer is full width and full height across the rear of the dwelling. This form of roof addition is incongruous with the pattern of development in the terrace, which displays very few dormers. The dormer is considered to be bulky and unsympathetic in appearance and design to the existing dwelling and terrace, would remove the majority of the existing roof, and is not subservient to the host dwelling.

Overall, the proposed rear dormer extension is considered to a introduce bulky, visually unsympathetic form of development that would be harmful to the visual amenities of the subject building, the street scene and the wider area generally, 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 2015.

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.

With regard to the adjoining property to the south, number 81, the proposed extension would extend 5.7m past the rear of the property, and the height of the extension on the boundary combined with its extensive depth would result in an increased sense of dominance and enclosure which would unduly harm the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of that adjoining property.

With regard to the adjoining property to the north, number 85, the proposed extension replaces an existing conservatory, and is adjacent to an extension on this property. As a result, the proposed development would not extend past the rear of this property, which would not result in any undue harm to the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of that adjoining property.

Overall, the proposal is considered not to be acceptable and would harm the amenities of surrounding neighbours with regards to loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or increased sense of enclosure and would not be in general accordance with saved UDP 2006 Policy UD3 and concurrent London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6.

6.3 Conclusions

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

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100sqm and therefore the proposal is not liable for Haringey's CIL charge or the Major's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2015/3210

Applicant's drawing No.(s) AP(00)01 Rev P1; AP(00)02 Rev P1; AP(00)03 Rev P1; AP(00)04 Rev P1; AP(00)05 Rev P1; AP(00)06 Rev P1; AP(00)07 Rev P1; AP(00)08 Rev P1

For the following reason(s)

The proposed rear extension due to its combined height, depth and proximity to the boundary would result in an unduly harmful loss of residential amenity for the occupants of 81 Steed Road by way of an increased sense of dominance and enclosure contrary to Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 'saved policy' UD3 and London Plan 2015 policies 7.4 and 7.6.

The proposed roof dormer, by reason of its bulk, size and scale, would introduce a discordant feature to the rear elevation of the building detracting from the visual appearance of the property and are therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area by reason of excessive bulk, scale and massing in relation to the host property, 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 2015.