LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/0586 **Ward:** Seven Sisters

Date received: 25/02/2016

Last amended date: N/a

Drawing number of plans: 20150521-PL01, 20150521-PL02, 20150521-PL05 and 20150521-PL06B

Address: 132 Wargrave Avenue N15 6UA

Proposal: Excavation of basement plus first floor rear extension (amended description).

Applicant: Mr Askler

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Samuel Uff

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) Basement impact

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the excavation of a basement below the existing dwelling. The plans also show a first floor rear extension, but this was not referred to in the description of development.

Site and Surroundings

The subject building is an end of terrace two storey dwellinghouse. The building is not listed nor is it located within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2006/1844 REF 07-11-06 Retrospective planning application for the retention of single storey rear extension.

HGY/2014/2903	REF 01-12-14	Erection of first floor rear extension.
HGY/2015/0074	REF 02-03-15 132	Erection of first floor rear extension
HGY/2015/1516	GTD 10-07-15	Erection of type 3 loft extension
HGY/2015/1517	REF 10-07-15	Erection of rear first floor extension
HGY/2015/3508	REF 18-01-16	Erection of rear first floor extension.
HGY/2016/0571	PERM REQ 19-04-16	Certificate of lawfulness for rear first floor extension

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 of individual responses: 2
Objecting: 1
Supporting: 1

5.2 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Impact on bus service / noise nuisance (Officer Comment: standard hours of construction detailed in informative)

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 and appearance

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. Draft DM Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' continues this approach and requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality.

The application is registered with the description "Excavation of Basement" but the plans indicate that this would also be for the erection of a first floor rear extension. The first floor rear extension has recently been subject of a lawful development certificate, which was refused. Prior to that application, similar first floor rear extensions were refused. Although the description does not refer to the first floor rear extension, this is on the proposed plans and as such must be considered to form part of the proposal.

The House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD was adopted in 2010 and amended in 2013 in response to the need for large units within the area. This was a design led document which sought to address the concerns regarding the inappropriate roof extensions within the area. The dwelling has previously had a type 3 extension approved and this is the accepted form of development in this area and is the preferable form of development for the area.

The first floor rear extension would have a depth of 2.6m and width of 3.8m. This would be more than half the width of the 5.75m wide original dwelling. The plans make reference to three other planning approvals for two storey rear extensions all of which are in different streets, approximately half the width of the original dwelling and in less prominent locations.

The gable design adds to the prominence of the extension and emphasises the significant width. Generally the size of the extension is considered excessive and overly dominant of this prominent rear elevation.

With regard to rear extensions the South Tottenham SPD states that *"extensions must be of the highest quality design, constructed in a sympathetic architectural style with detailing, fenestration and materials to match the existing style".* In this instance the first floor window would be of a similar style to the existing window but would lack the detailing of the original building, especially the brick arch above the window.

The basement would be served by a significant front lightwell, but this appears to be approximately half the depth of the front garden and views of this would be obscured from the public highway by the front and side boundary treatment.

Overall it is considered that the proposed first floor rear extension by reason of its height, scale and bulk on this prominent site would result in an incongruous, dominant and unsympathetic extension that would not appear subservient to the existing host building.

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. Draft DM Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' continues this approach and requires developments to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for its users and neighbours.

The proposed first floor extension would comply with the 45 degree BRE guideline and is not considered to discernibly harm the amenities of adjoining neighbours with regards to outlook, daylight/sunlight or an increased sense of enclosure.

The basement would be subterranean and therefore would not have an amenity impact beyond that of the concerns regarding the lack of a basement impact assessment, as detailed below.

6.3 Basement impact

Draft DM Policy 18 sets out that Householder extensions to existing basements or the construction of new basements in existing dwellings will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal:

a) Will not adversely affect the structural stability of the application building, neighbouring buildings and other infrastructure, including the adjoining highway, having regard to local geological conditions;

b) Does not increase flood risk to the property and nearby properties from any source.

No information has been submitted regarding ground conditions; hydrology and flow of water locally; the means of construction; the way the space is intended to be used and cumulative. This is particularly problematic on this site with the excessive level of development previously undertaken above the basement level and the large expanse of the site being occupied by the developments.

6.4 Conclusions

The application has an inaccurate description by omitting the first floor rear extension. This has been considered as part of the application and the description has been amended.

The proposed first floor rear extension is considered excessive and to have poor design.

The proposed basement excavation is not supported by a basemen impact assessment, contrary to emerging DM policy.

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/2016/0586

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 20150521-PL01, 20150521-PL02, 20150521-PL05 and 20150521-PL06/B

For the following reason(s)

The first floor rear extension, by virtue of siting, design, bulk and scale and in conjunction with the overdevelopment of the site as a whole would detract from the appearance of the original dwelling and create a discordant relationship with the terrace of which it forms a part, to the detriment of the area as a whole. As such the development would be 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 2015 and Emerging Policy DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD.

No basement impact assessment has been submitted to demonstrate that the significant excavation of the basement below the already significantly extended dwelling would not compromise the structural stability of the building or adjacent buildings and highway, whilst also failing to clarify that there would not be significant risk of the property and nearby properties being at increased risk from flooding. As such the development is contrary to Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey's Unitary Development Plan 2006, policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan, and draft policies DM18 and DM24 of Haringey's Development Management DPD.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that the description of development must refer to all relevant parts of the site that are shown as part of the proposal.