LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/2704 **Ward:** Noel Park

Date received: 28/06/2016

Drawing number of plans: (Prefix-1388_) P01, P02 Rev A and P03 Rev A.

Address: 1 Meads Road N22 6RN

Proposal: Erection of rear outbuilding.

Applicant: Mr Larry Ashagbe

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 16/09/2016

Officer contact: Nanayaa Ampoma

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

3. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site relates to a two storey mid-terrace house. The property benefits from an existing rear outrigger as part of its original design. The area around the application site is residential in nature. Originally the property was one house however permission was given in the early 2000s for it to be converted into flats.

The current proposal relates to the ground floor unit. At the time of the site visit the flat was used as HMO.

The site is not located in a conservation area and is not locally listed.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- **HGY/2016/2704**: Erection of rear outbuilding. - *Pending Decision*
- **HGY/2008/0411**: Erection of rear dormer window and insertion of 2 x velux windows to front roofslope. - *Grant permission*
- **HGY/2008/0410**: Erection of single storey rear ground floor extension. - *Grant permission*
- **HGY/2006/1446**: Conversion of property into 2 x two bed self contained flats - *Grant permission*
- **HGY/2006/1133**: Certificate Of Lawfulness (Proposed) for the erection of a single storey rear extension. - *Permission not required*
- **HGY/2005/2000:** Erection of rear dormer window and insertion of 2 rooflights to front elevation. - *Permission not required*

5. DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of rear garden outbuilding. The building would be 6 metres in length and 5 metres in width. The building will be 2.5 metres in height. The space would be used as a games room.

6. CONSULTATION

The application has been publicised by way of direct neighbour letters. Neighbour comments have been received from number 3(upper floor flat) Meads Road. These comments can be summarised as follows-

- The property is a HMO which is not made clear on the planning application.
- There is a large established tree in the garden which is not shown on the plans which would have to be cut down to build the proposed outbuilding.
- The owners use a rear entrance which leads onto The Sandlings to enter the area of the proposed outbuilding which is currently used to store building materials. This is also not shown on the plans on the application.
- The existing extension which was granted planning permission has since been extended further without permission however the enforcement team decided it was not worth taking any action on but I do not know whether this affects the 50% ratio of the remaining garden.

Officer response: The property was confirmed as a HMO during a site visit on 16/09/2016. There is also a tree in the rear garden that has not been included in the plans. While the property is not within a conservation area and there is no TPO, it is required that a fair representation of the existing situation on the ground is represented within the plans. The applicant has been given a suitable amount of time to correct the plans, however they have failed to do so. This is also the case for the rear entrance gate. This too has been confirmed during the site visit however is not included on the plans. The issues relating to enforcement are currently being investigated by the Enforcement Team. Please see section titled Design for comments regarding the 50% ratio.

7. ASSESSMENT

The main areas for consideration are:

- Design
- Amenity

7.1 Design

Saved UDP Policy UD3 (General Principles) requires that new developments complement the character, nature and scale of the local area and the host property, whilst Local Plan policy SP11 (Design) promotes high quality designs to create attractive, sustainable buildings in their local context. This is supported by the London Plan Policies 7.4 (Local character) and 7.6 (Architecture) and Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Requiring good design). In addition, the Council aims to strengthen these policies in the emerging Development Plan Documents under policy DM12 (Housing Design and Quality) which states that all new householder extensions should appear subordinate to the main house especially by way of their footprint.

While the height of the outbuilding is acceptable, the footprint of the building considered to be too large for the residential terrace house and out of character with the area. While the gardens of these terraces are of a relatively large, the proposed outbuilding would take up a significant amount of the residential garden space. Due to the division of the rear garden at the time of the site visit, it was not clear whether the proposed location plan was correct. However officers are of the opinion that it is misleading and is not to scale. The proposed outbuilding would dominate the garden area at 1 Meads Road and would be much larger than other ancillary structures in the surrounding area

around it. As such, it would be an incongruous element that would be harmful to the character of the area and the host property.

Furthermore at the time of the site visit it appeared as though the garden area had been divided into two areas. One area was used by the HMO of the main house and the other was used to store building materials. Access to this area was provided by a separate gate. The applicant was made aware of these inconsistencies during the site visit and formally by email communication. However they failed to provide amended plans. Given the scale of the proposed building in relation to the existing HMO it does not appear that the building would be used ancillary to the purposes of the HMO. The physical separation between the dwelling and the existing HMO further reinforces the concern that the outbuilding would not be ancillary to the HMO.

In light of the above, the application fails to comply with the policies set out above.

7.2 Amenity

Saved policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there will be no unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of existing and proposed residents in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy or overlooking. Similarly, London Plan policy 7.6 requires that buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy. In addition, emerging policy DM12 also requires that all new development protect the existing amenity of neighbours.

The proposed outbuilding would be build at the furthermost rear of the garden. At this area there is heavy planting and a large tree.

Nevertheless, should the development be built as detailed on the proposed plans, the resulting outbuilding is unlikely to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by way of loss of light, enclosure or loss of privacy. The development would not give rise to increased or additional views into neighbouring properties that cannot already be seen on site. Due to its position, it would not lead to a greater feeling of enclosure or loss of light. As such, it is considered that the development is acceptable on amenity grounds.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSED

Registered No. HGY/2016/2704

Applicant's drawing No.(s): (Prefix-1388_) P01, P02 Rev A and P03 Rev A.

The proposed outbuilding by reason of its scale and location would not remain ancillary to th existing dwelling and would result in an overly dominant structure in the rear garden, would significant reduce the scale of remaining garden space and have a detrimental impact on the character of the terrace property contrary to policies SP11 (Design) of the Haringey Local Plan (2013), saved Policy UD3 (General Principles) of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006), as well as policies 7.4 (Local character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan (March 2015) consolidated with alterations since 2011 and policy DM12 of emerging Development Plan (2016).