LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/3494 **Ward:** Northumberland Park

Date received: 24/11/2015

Last amended date: DD/MM/YYYY

Drawing number of plans: 752/NP/S1(R), 752/NP/01(R), 752/NP/02(R), 752/NP/03(R) and 752/NP/04(R)

Address: Unit 2 66 Northumberland Park N17 0TT

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension and part first floor extension

Applicant: Mr K Azarian

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Sarah Madondo

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

Reasons for Refusal:

The proposed extension by reason of its depth, bulk, height and positioning up to both neighbouring boundaries would result in an overbearing and dominant development giving rise to an increase sense of enclosure and loss of outlook and daylight/sunlight to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties , contrary to policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and saved policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the erection of a single storey rear extension part first floor extension.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is in Northumberland Park ward. The site is a semi-detached three storey Victorian building, which is of a substantial size and divided into flats. The property is situated next to three similar properties of matching character and appearance. The site is not within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2002/1668 GTD 04-02-03 66 Northumberland Park London Erection of single storey rear extension and conversion to form 1 x 2 bed and 2 x 1 bed self contained flats

HGY/2012/1602 GTD 30-10-12 66 Northumberland Park London Use of property as 4 self-contained flats

HGY/2014/0335 REF 31-03-14 66 Northumberland Park London Erection of a single storey rear and part first floor extension.

HGY/2014/1273 GTD 01-07-14 66 Northumberland Park London Erection of single storey rear extension

HGY/2015/2778 REF 16-11-15 Unit 2 66 Northumberland Park London Erection of a single storey rear extension and first floor "L shape" extension

OLD/1974/0519 GTD 28-10-74 318-328 High Road Erection of single storey building to house new sanitary accommodation and new chauffeurs room for existing funeral establishment.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:
:

Ward Councillors
Neighbouring properties

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 17 letters

No of individual responses:
Objecting:1
Supporting:0

5.1 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- Cllr Bevan

5.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Overlooking
- loss of light
- Space standards

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance and character of the area

2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

6.1 Design and appearance and character of the area

6.2 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. In terms of the depth of the rear extension SPG1a states that rear extensions should not normally extend beyond 3 metres (10 ft.) for terraced houses and 4 metres (13 ft.) for semi-detached or detached houses from the rear wall of the original house.

6.3 The proposal is a resubmission following a refusal. The proposal has been amended such that the first floor extension would be 3 metres deep and the L shape element has been omitted. The ground floor extension would be 3.5 metres deep as the previous scheme. The proposed extension would be built in matching materials with a flat roof.

6.4 The single storey rear extension element would be of a similar depth to an extension existing on the eastern neighbour's building. Whilst it is full width, it would only be single storey. This coupled with the overall generous depth of the rear garden, is not considered to be so harmful as to warrant refusal as the proposal would still be seen as subservient in appearance to the existing building.

6.5 The first floor element would be 3 metres deep. Although the first has been reduced, it is considered that the proposal would appear extremely deep given that number 68 does not have deeper extensions.

6.6 However given the overall variety of townscape in the area the proposed first floor extension is not considered incongruous to the local townscape vernacular which includes significantly extended traditional suburban development and more recent infill development of blocks of flats.

6.7 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.8 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.

6.9 Concerns have been raised by a local ward Councillor in respect of loss of loss daylight/sunlight and overlooking. The mass and bulk of the proposal when viewed from the nearest windows and gardens of neighbouring properties would cause a significant loss of daylight/ sunlight. Having specific regards to the sun's trajectory and the orientation of the building in question the effect on daylight and sunlight to the windows of No 68 would be significant. It is also considered that the additional

extension, by reason of its size and massing would have an overbearing relationship to adjoining properties particularly number 64 Northumberland park which would be adjacent to the 2-storey element of the proposed extension.

6.10 Conclusions

The proposed extension by reason of its depth, bulk, height and positioning up to both neighbouring boundaries would result in an overbearing and dominant development giving rise to an increase sense of enclosure and loss of outlook, daylight/sunlight to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities to the occupiers of both adjoining properties and the other flats with No 68, contrary to policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and saved policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

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/2015/3494

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 752/NP/S1(R), 752/NP/01(R), 752/NP/02(R), 752/NP/03(R) and 752/NP/04(R)

The proposed extension by reason of its depth, bulk, height and positioning up to both neighbouring boundaries would result in an overbearing and dominant development giving rise to an increase sense of enclosure and loss of outloo and daylight/sunlight to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties, contrary to policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and saved policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.