LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 18/12/2015

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/3188 **Ward:** Fortis Green

Date received: 27/10/2015

Drawing number of plans: 3/8 Rev A; 4/8 Rev A; 5/8 Rev A; 6/8 Rev A; 7/8 Rev A; 8/8 Rev A; OS Plan; Block Plan

Address: 144 Osier Crescent N10 1RF

Proposal: Replacement of existing conservatory with new orangery to the rear of the property (householder application)

Applicant: Mrs C Lawson

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Adam Flynn

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) The proposed 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 146 Osier Crescent 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.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposed development

This is an application for the replacement of existing conservatory with new orangery to the rear of the property (householder application)

3.2 Site and Surroundings

The site is a three-storey terraced dwelling located on the southern side of Osier Crescent. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, and is made up of similar terraced dwellings.

3.3 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

No relevant history.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 No consultation required.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 6 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

The proposal should be considered alongside the NPPF 2012, saved UDP 2006 policy UD3, London Plan 2015 policy 7.8 and Local Plan 2013 policy SP11. Overall, 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 only visible changes as a result of the proposal would be to the rear, which has no public vantage points. It is also noted that other properties in the terrace have been extended at the rear. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area.

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 east, number 146, the proposed extension would extend 4m 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 west, number 142, the proposed extension replaces a smaller existing conservatory. As a result, the proposed development would extend 3m past the rear of this property, which is not considered to 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/2015/3188

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 3/8 Rev A; 4/8 Rev A; 5/8 Rev A; 6/8 Rev A; 7/8 Rev A; 8/8 Rev A; OS Plan; Block Plan

For the following reason(s)

The proposed 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 146 Osier Crescent 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.