LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/3325 **Ward:** Bruce Grove

Date received: 10/11/2015

Last amended date: N/a

Drawing number of plans: 027.15/01; 02; 03; 04

Address: 12 Handsworth Road N17 6DE

Proposal: Erection of rear extension with internal alterations (householder application)

Applicant: Ms Gazel Topkaya

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 11/12/2015

Officer contact: Samuel Uff

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) Unauthorised change of use
2) Design
3) Amenity impact

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for a single storey rear extension beyond an existing extension.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is located on the eastern side of Handsworth Road and contains a two-storey dwelling with additional two storey rear outrigger. The dwelling has been previously extended beyond the rear outrigger and a shed has been erected at the rear of the garden.

3.3 The authorised use of the site is as a single family dwelling, but with two bedrooms covering half of the ground floor and from conversation with the applicant, it appears that the use may be as a small HMO (C4), which would require planning permission as it is within the Article 4 direction area for conversions. The site is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.4 No history

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 No consultation required.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 7 neighbouring 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

6.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development;
2. The design impact;
3. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Principle of the development

6.2 The application site is within Bruce Grove Ward, located within a designated HMO restricted area for the East of Haringey (as designated in 2012). The existing dwelling has two bedrooms in the ground floor, suggesting that this is in use as an HMO and this issue will need to be investigated by Planning Enforcement. The applicant has sent an email stating that all of the members of the house are related, prompted by a telephone conversation where it was inferred by the applicant that the rooms were being rented out. Any extension to the dwelling will need to consider the existing and proposed use of the site in the assessment.

6.3 The original dwelling has also been extended without the benefit of planning permission. Consideration of the extension to the existing extension is problematic in that the development would constitute an extension to an unauthorised part of the building. As such, any future submission should include the retention of the existing extensions in the description.

Design impact

6.4 Local Plan Policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. 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 which is supported by London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6.

6.6 The existing extension beyond the rear outrigger aligns with the adjoining neighbour at no.14 and has a hipped roof along the shared boundary with no.10. The proposed extension would be to the rear of this structure and would have a flat roof, continuing the height of 3m, with additional 200mm high parapet wall. This would have a total depth of 4.1m and two distinct roof forms.

6.7 Although this is to the rear of the property, the development would still have a detrimental impact on the original design of the dwelling, visible from the rear of neighbouring properties, due to the varied roof form and overall bulk of development. The extension is set partially off the boundary but this does not sufficiently reduce the bulk of development. As such this is recommended for refusal due to the undesirable design.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.8 The London Plan 2015 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.

6.9 The 3.2m height of the 3m depth beyond the existing extension would create a total depth of approximately 6.5m adjacent to the boundary with no. 10. The parapet wall is considered to be detrimental to this neighbour by creating an undesirable sense of enclosure.

6.10 No.14 would have a depth of 3m beyond their existing extension. Whilst the 3.2m height is large and the property is to the north, the lack of habitable windows in the rear elevation of this neighbour mean that there would not be a significant impact on daylight or sunlight.

Conclusions

6.11 The use of the site has been drawn into question due to the internal configuration and the extensions are considered to be of low quality design and detrimental to amenity. As such it is recommended that this be refused.

6.12 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

7.1 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/2015/3325

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 027.15/01; 02; 03; 04

For the following reason(s)

1. The proposed extension would be to an unauthorised extension and would appear to be to an intensification of the unauthorised use as an HMO, by virtue of the ground floor bedrooms and, as such, would be contrary to Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and the Council's Article 4 Direction for HMOs in the East of Haringey (2012).

2. The single storey rear extension to an existing extension by reason of siting, height, overall bulk and variable roof design would result in an overly dominant addition which would fail to be sympathetic to the architectural composition of the original building and terrace as a whole, contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, Saved UDP Policy UD3 and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.

3. The single storey rear extension to an existing extension by reason of siting and height, in particular the projection into the side lightwell, would result in an overly dominant addition which result in an increased sense of enclosure to the neighbouring dwelling at no.10 Handsworth Road, , contrary to Policies 7.4 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, Saved UDP Policy UD3 and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.