LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2015/3419 **Ward:** St Anns

Date received: 18/11/2015

Last amended date: N/a

Drawing number of plans: RG/504/10, RG/504/11, RG/504/12 Rev A, RG/504/13, RG/504/15 Rev F & RG/504/16 Rev C

Address: 74A Roseberry Gardens N4 1JL

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension (amendment to extension approved in HGY/2014/1202).

Applicant: Mr & Mrs James + Lorie Copeman + Trainor-Buckingham

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date:

Officer contact: Samuel Uff

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) Design
2) Amenity

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for a rear extension beyond the original two storey rear outrigger and an infill extension to the side of this element. The infill extension would have a height of 2.1m and would be for storage. The rear extension would have a depth of 4m and would be full width, projecting beyond the lightwell.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace property located on the southern side of Roseberry Gardens.

The property is not a Listed Building and is not located within a Conservation Area.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2014/0237 GTD 18-03-14 74 Roseberry Gardens London Erection of a roof extension with a rear terrace and three roof lights to front roofslope

HGY/2014/1202 GTD 17-06-14 74A Roseberry Gardens London Erection of single storey rear extension, removal of window from bedroom and replace with double-glazed double opening crittal doors.

HGY/2015/2289 GTD 17-08-15 74A Roseberry Gardens London Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/1202 to replace the window in the extension with crittal double opening doors

OLD/1981/1343 GTD 18-06-81 74 Roseberry Gardens 5/5/81 Conversion into two self-contained flats .

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- None required

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

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

No response received.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

6.1 Design impact

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 and the avoidance of air, water, light and noise, pollution and of fume and smell nuisance.

The part of the extension adjacent to no.76 is tapered in so that the depth along this boundary remains at the 3 metres previously approved. This creates a somewhat unorthodox relationship between the extension and this boundary. The overall depth of 4 metres of the majority of the extension is considered to be excessive in size, especially given the projection beyond the flank wall of the outrigger and full width site coverage. As

such it is considered that the proposed extension would be an undesirable addition to the dwelling, to the detriment of the site and surrounding area.

The low height of the storage area and siting behind the large extension would not be highly visible from the neighbouring dwelling.

6.2 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.

The plans depict dotted lines from the rear windows of the neighbours, but this does not appear to be the required 45-degree angle as detailed in the BRE guidance. The height and projection of the extension beyond the side and rear of the outrigger is considered to be excessive and would cause an undesirable sense of enclosure or loss of daylight to these neighbours, exacerbated by the south facing rear elevations.

The height of the storage area has been kept to a height approximately the same as a fence could be developed without requiring planning permission and would not project beyond the depth of the outrigger.

6.3 Conclusions

The proposed height, depth and full width site coverage would have a detrimental design in the context of the site and surroundings and would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the adjoining dwellings.

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/2015/3419

Applicant's drawing No.(s) RG/504/10, RG/504/11, RG/504/12 Rev A, RG/504/13, RG/504/15 Rev F & RG/504/16 Rev C

For the following reason(s)

The proposed development would detract from the architectural appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area and would adversely affect the visual amenity of the locality contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015.

The proposed rear extension by reason of its height and depth would have an overbearing relationship to the neighbouring property and result in a increased sense of enclosure and loss of daylight to that property to the detriment of residential amenity and contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015 and S saved policy UD3 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan.