LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/0728 **Ward:** Bruce Grove

Date received: 08/03/2016

Drawing number of plans: 0036/01 Rev. A; 0036/02 Rev. A; 0036/03 Rev. C; 0036/04 Rev. C; 0036/05 Rev. A

Address: 60 Ranelagh Road N17 6XU

Proposal: Erection of side/rear extension, replacement of rear bay window with new French doors, formation of rear dormers and insertion of front rooflights (householder application)

Applicant: Ms Bless Akoli

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: David Farndon

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) The proposed dormer, by reason of its location on the outrigger and associated scale, would be an incongruous and unattractive addition, detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building, terraced row and wider area, contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, and draft policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD.

2) The proposed side/rear extension, by reason of the inadequately sized courtyard area, provides an insufficiently functional amenity area that also does not adequately offset the scale of the extension, and thus would be detrimental to the amenity of host and adjoining occupiers, contrary to draft policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD, policy 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, and The London Plan's 'Housing' Supplementary Planning Guidance

Informatives:

1) *The applicant should note that there is an error in the proposed plans as the 'North West Elevation' on the Proposed Elevations incorrectly includes the rear bay*

window which is actually proposed to be removed under this application. Any future application must ensure that the correct plans and elevations are submitted.

2) *The applicant is advised to read the Case Officer Report to understand the reasoning behind the reasons for refusal.*

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is an application for the erection of rear/side extension, replacement of rear bay window with new French doors, formation of rear dormers and insertion of front rooflights.

Site and Surroundings

A two storey terrace building two storey dwellinghouse located on the eastern side of Ranelagh Road. The area is characterised by two storey residential properties with two storey rear outriggers. The property is not listed or within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- HGY/2015/3242 GTD on 21/12/15 – Erection of rear side extension, replacement of rear bay window with new French doors, formation of rear dormer and insertion of front rooflights

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- No responses received.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- No responses received

6 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 host building, terraced row and street scene.

2. The impact on the amenity of host and 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, and draft Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that all residential extensions are required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and/or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of original buildings.

The proposed loss of the rear bay and insertion of French doors will have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the area and thus is considered acceptable. The proposed side/rear extension which effectively infills the area on the flank of the outrigger is of an awkward form given that the courtyard area proposed is extremely small (see below). It would also benefit from a wider fenestration opening being incorporated into its rear elevation which it shares with the outrigger (both in terms of reducing the blank facade area on the extension at the rear as well as increasing daylight into the rear ground floor area). However, the general appearance of the extension, whilst extending to be in line with the outrigger's rear elevation, is similar to that as approved under application HGY/2015/3242 and is thus considered acceptable.

The front rooflights are considered acceptable so long as they do not protrude further than 0.15m from the roofslope. However, the main issue is with regard to the appearance of the property is the dormer extension on the roof. Whilst the dormer element on the main roof is considered acceptable, given that it is set off the main rear elevation and flanks of the roof, the dormer element on the outrigger is considered unacceptable.

There are no such extensions within the vicinity and therefore the proposed introduction of the dormer on the outrigger here would create an incongruous and alien addition to the host building and terrace, detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and wider area. It is noted that an extension of this size *may* be undertaken through permitted development (dependent on meeting the required space standards and the property being a single dwellinghouse). However, the dormer proposed here is submitted as part of a planning application and therefore must be judged on its merits. The potential for the roof extension to be permitted development does not override the consideration that must be given to proposals under the assessment of a planning application. Thus, given that it is an incongruous structure which creates an additional mass and form on the outrigger that detracts from the appearance of the building, the dormer cannot be supported.

The applicant should note that there is an error in the proposed plans as the 'North West Elevation' on the Proposed Elevations incorrectly includes the rear bay window which is actually proposed to be removed under this application. Any future application must ensure that the correct plans and elevations are submitted.

6.2 Impact on the amenity of host and 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 policy DM1 of Haringey's Development Management DPD, 'Delivering High Quality Design', continues this approach and requires developments to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for its users and neighbours, as does DM12, 'Housing Design and Quality', which seeks to ensure residential extensions take account of the privacy and amenity of neighbouring uses.

The proposed dormer and rooflights will not create any additional vantage points that would be detrimental to the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. Whilst the dormer is of an excessive scale in terms of its appearance, specifically on the outrigger, it is situated sufficiently from the boundary of the neighbouring occupiers so not to impact on their amenity.

Thus, the main element to be considered is the side/rear extension which infills the area adjacent to the outrigger. This extension now extends to the rear of the building line created by the outrigger (as opposed to the previously approved application - HGY/2015/3242). The extension is relatively large in scale, standing at 3.31m in height along the adjoining boundary. Whilst it is acknowledged that the previously approved application was of a similar scale, it was, as indicated above, set off the main building line by just over 0.5m.

A courtyard has been introduced in this proposal which, to some extent, seeks to offset the small loss of openness at the rear of the building resulting from the extension's increase in depth. However, this courtyard is of a diminutive size that does not provide a reasonably functioning space. *Standard 27* of the London Plan's 'Housing' Supplementary Planning Guidance establishes the principal that private open space should have a minimum depth and width of 1.5m. The courtyard area proposed here is only 1.05m in depth. This is an insufficient area that would not provide any reasonable function. Furthermore, given its limited size, it would not provide much by way of an increase in daylight reaching the main dining room area given the height of the extension and nor would it provide much relief for the amenity of neighbouring occupiers who face an extension that now extends the full depth of the outrigger. Thus, the proposed side/rear extension is considered unacceptable with regard to it functionality and amenity value for host occupiers, and has an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

For the reasons set out above, this application cannot be supported.

6.3 Conclusion

1) The proposed dormer, by reason of its location on the outrigger and associated scale, would be an incongruous and unattractive addition, detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building, terraced row and wider area, contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, and draft policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD.

2) The proposed side/rear extension, by reason of the inadequately sized courtyard area, provides an insufficiently functional amenity area that also does not adequately offset the scale of the extension, and thus would be detrimental to the amenity of host and adjoining occupiers, contrary to draft policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD, policy 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, and The London Plan's 'Housing' Supplementary Planning Guidance

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reason set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the SUMMARY OF 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/2016/0728

Applicant's drawing No.(s): 0036/01 Rev. A; 0036/02 Rev. A; 0036/03 Rev. C; 0036/04 Rev. C; 0036/05 Rev. A

The proposed dormer, by reason of its location on the outrigger and associated scale, would be an incongruous and unattractive addition, detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building, terraced row and wider area, contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, and draft policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD.

The proposed side/rear extension, by reason of the inadequately sized courtyard area, provides an insufficiently functional amenity area that also does not adequately offset the scale of the extension, and thus would be detrimental to the amenity of host and adjoining occupiers, contrary to draft policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD, policy 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, and The London Plan's 'Housing' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The applicant should note that there is an error in the proposed plans as the 'North West Elevation' on the Proposed Elevations incorrectly includes the rear bay window which is actually proposed to be removed under this application. Any future application must ensure that the correct plans and elevations are submitted.
The applicant is advised to read the Case Officer Report to understand the reasoning behind the reasons for refusal.