LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/0695 **Ward:** Bounds Green

Date received: 09/03/2016

Drawing number of plans: CHM/3578/A1 and OS

Address: 17 Maidstone Road N11 2TR

Proposal: Construction of an outbuilding in the rear garden (4m maximum height)

Applicant: Mr P Patel

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Wendy Robinson

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for a detached outbuilding in the rear garden, 2.5m in height at eaves, maximum height 4m with pitch roof design.

Site and surroundings

3.2 The subject site is a mid-terrace dwelling which has previously been converted into three flats and extended *ad hoc* without the appropriate permissions.

3.3 The site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.4 APP/2014/00090 APPEAL DISMISSED Outbuilding and hard standing to be moved as constructed without permission

3.5 OLD/1984/0814 GTD May 1984 Conversion of property into three flats

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 No consultation was undertaken.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

Character and appearance of the area

5.1 SPG1a 'Design guidance' in accordance with the expectations of the NPPF, saved UDP Policy UD3, emerging Policy DM1 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (January 2016 pre-submission version), London Plan Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, Local Plan Policy SP11, states that extensions or alterations to buildings should be subordinate in scale to the original building, should respect its architectural character and should not dominate existing features important to the building.

5.2 The outbuilding proposed with maximum height of 4m and pitch roof gable end design would be out of character in relation to the flat roof outbuildings of the adjoining properties. It is acknowledged that the Planning Inspector decision dated 24/09/2015 (reference: APP/Y5420/C/14/2226807/8) considered the terrace of outbuildings (at that time all 2.5m high with flat roof designs) results in a uniform block formation which harms the appearance of the rear garden areas. This is not a viewed shared by the officer. The large roof design currently proposed is considered likely to dominate the rear garden and draw further attention to the massing in the rear garden and further harm the appearance of the rear garden areas.

5.3 The proposal is not considered proportionate or subordinate to the character of the surrounding area and is not in keeping with the pattern of development in the area. Therefore, the local character and visual amenity of the area will be harmed by the proposed development and is therefore contrary to the above policies.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

5.4 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 and emerging Policy DM1 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (January 2016 pre-submission version) 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.

5.5 The height and depth of the extension would not result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight, or have an overbearing appearance to the neighbouring property. There will be no material loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The proposal is acceptable in amenity terms in accordance with the above policies.

Conclusions

5.6 The proposal would be an incongruous feature which is not in keeping with the pattern of development in the area and would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity.

5.7 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.

6. CIL APPLICABLE

6.1 The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100m^2 and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2016/0695

Applicant's drawing No.(s) CHM/3578/A1 and OS

For the following reason(s)

The proposed development would be out of keeping with the general pattern, standard and character of the area by reason of general bulk and massing within the site thereby resulting in an incongruous pattern of development detrimental to the amenities of the area contrary to Policy 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan, Emerging Policy DM1 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (January 2016 pre-submission version) and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

The proposed development would be out of keeping with the general pattern, standard and character of the area by reason of general bulk and massing within the site thereby resulting in an incongruous pattern of development detrimental to the amenities of the area contrary to Policy 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan, Emerging Policy DM1 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (January 2016 pre-submission version) and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.