LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/3244 **Ward:** Tottenham Green

Date received: 02/11/2015

Last amended date: N/a

Drawing number of plans: A000 – Block Plan, A000 – Location Plan, A100, A101, A102, A103, A104 and A105

Address: 489 Seven Sisters Road N15 6EP

Proposal: Conversion of 3 bedroom flat to create 1x1 studio, 1x1 bedroom and 1x2 bedroom flats with single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer extension and with Juliet balcony

Applicant: Mr Turabi Keskin

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 01/12/2015

Officer contact: Samuel Uff

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) Design impact
2) Amenity

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for a first floor rear extension, rear roof extension and conversion of upper floor flats to a studio flat, 1x 1 bed flat and 1x 2 bed flat.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is a mid-terrace, three-storey building with front gable and pitched roof. The ground floor is currently unoccupied as a retail unit. The upper floors are used as residential. There is one other example of a roof extension within the terrace at no.517, but this does not have planning permission. The site is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2005/0024 GTD 15-02-05 489 Seven Sisters Road London Erection of extension at rear first floor level to create 1 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed self contained flats.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal:

1) LBH Transportation Team: No car park or cycle parking provision but not in area designated as significant parking stress and there are site restrictions that would be it problematic for cycle parking. Construction Logistics Plan would be required.

2) LBH Waste Team: Standard roadside collection required. This would need to be located at the front of the building. Should be conditioned.

External:

3) Thames Water: No objection.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 7 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No responses received.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development;
2. Design impact;
3. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
4. Living conditions for future occupants;
5. Parking and highway safety;

6.1 Principle of the development

The principle of residential above the shop has already been accepted and the increase in density is considered to be acceptable subject to all other planning considerations.

6.2 Design impact

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's Local Plan Policy SP11 and Saved UDP Policy UD3 'General Principles' reinforce this strategic approach.

The applicant has supplied a section with an eyeline view from the other side of the road. This suggests that the proposed roof extension would not be visible from the street. However, this fails to acknowledge the proximity of Albert Road, which would likely allow a deeper field of view and partial visibility of the roof extension from that junction.

Although the impact on the frontage of the building is somewhat open to interpretation, it is clear that the visual impact from the public land and numerous residential properties to the rear of the site would be significant. The proposed roof extension would fail to respect the original pitched roof design, which is largely unchanged within the terrace. Whilst there have been some large rear extensions, these appear to be generally no deeper than the existing extension serving this building. Many of the developments have been erected historically and/or without planning permission.

The scale and cumulative impact of the first floor rear extension to the existing extension, coupled with the impact of the substantial rear roof extension would be excessive and to the detriment of the original design of the building and the terrace of which it forms a part. Although there is one large rear roof extension at the far end of the terrace, this was developed without the benefit of planning permission and does not have the same level of development to the remainder of the building. As such it is considered that the proposed extensions would have a significantly detrimental impact on the building and area as a whole.

6.3 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

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.

No information has been submitted regarding the use of the adjacent rear windows serving either adjoining neighbour and it was not clear from looking at the external facade. However, it is clear that both of the upper floors contain residential uses and as such, any impact on adjacent windows must be considered. The applicant has depicted a 45-degree angle from the extension to the closest window, which fails the BRE test. As such it is deemed to be undesirable in terms of sense of enclosure and loss of sunlight and daylight to these windows.

6.4 Living conditions for future occupants

London Policy 7.6 says that new development should be of the highest architectural quality, whilst also being of an appropriate proportion and scale so as not to cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, especially where these are in residential use. This is also reflected in Saved UDP Policy UD3.

The internal floor areas generally would comply with London Plan standards, but this is only through the extensions which are considered to be undesirable in terms of design and amenity. The studio flat would be sited directly below kitchen / living area / bathroom, which is not considered to be a suitable arrangement of stacking. It is considered that a reworking of the internal arrangement could overcome these concerns. This alone would not necessarily constitute a reason for refusal but should be considered in any future resubmission.

6.5 Parking and highway safety

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

The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted and advises that the area is not a significant area for parking stress. Also acknowledges that there would be difficulty in providing cycle storage given the ground floor use of the site and location of the building. The increase in projected numbers is not considered to be significantly greater than the currently authorised level.

6.6 Conclusions

The proposed extensions to the already extended rear elevation would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the original building and terrace as a whole. The cumulative depth of the first floor extension would have a significant and detrimental impact on the residential amenity of both adjoining neighbours. The lack of cycle parking and poor internal configuration are undesirable but do not constitute reasons for refusal in and of themselves.

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 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2015/3244

Applicant's drawing No.(s) A000 – Block Plan, A000 – Location Plan, A100, A101, A102, A103, A104 and A105

For the following reason(s)

The proposas, by reason of its size design, scale, bulk and siting of the roof and first floor rear extensions would have a detrimental impact on the original design of the building and would result in an overdevelopment of the site and unbalance the terrace as a whole. As such the development would be detrimental to the dwelling and surrounding area, contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011.

The proposed first floor rear extension, by reason of its size, scale, siting, bulk and height would result in an overbearing sense of enclosure and a loss of sunlight and daylight, to the detriment of the amenity of adjacent occupiers. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policy 7.4 of The London Plan 2015, Saved UDP Policy UD3 and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is further advised to consider the internal layout and stacking of flats in any future submissions, as well as submitting a design and access statement to explain any shortcomings of the proposal.