LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/2575 **Ward:** White Hart Lane

Date received: 29/07/2016

Drawing number of plans: HC-01, HC-02, HC-03, HC-04, HC-05, HC-06 & HC-07

Address: 106 Risley Avenue N17 7ES

Proposal: Construction of 1.15m side extension to existing rear extension (householder application)

Applicant: Mr Hakan Calabakul

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 05/09/2016

Officer contact: Laurence Ackrill

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for a side extension to an existing single storey rear extension. The existing rear extension would be extended by 1.15m up to the boundary facing Siward Road.

3.2 The height of the extension has been built with a flat roof. However, the proposal as part of this application proposes a partially pitched roof, with an eaves height of 2.7 metres and a maximum height of 3.2 metres. The extension would have the same depth as the existing extension of 4.6 metres.

Site and Surroundings

3.3 The application site relates to a two storey, end of terrace dwelling located on a corner plot on the southern side of Risley Avenue and the junction with Siward Road.

3.4 The host property is not listed, however the site is located within the Tower Gardens Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- None

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Conservation Officer
- Tottenham CAAC

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 5 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: 1
Objecting: 1
Supporting: 0

5.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

5.3 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- None

5.4 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- The design of the extension is out of character with the conservation area
- It would set a precedent for further inappropriate development
- The materials used are out of character

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 conservation area; and
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

6.1 Design and character and appearance of the conservation area

Local Plan (2013) 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 (2016) Policies 7.4 and 7.6. Draft DM Policy (2015)

DM1 ‘Delivering High Quality Design’ continues this approach and requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality.

London Plan Policy 7.8 requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey’s heritage assets. Emerging policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (2015) continues this approach.

Saved UDP (2006) Policy CSV5 requires alterations and extensions to preserve and maintain the character of conservation areas and also respect characteristic features such as doors, windows or materials of buildings. This should be considered alongside Chapter 12 of the NPPF, SPG2 ‘Conservation and archaeology’.

Policy DM12 of emerging Development Management DPD policy document states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.

It is noted that there is an existing rear extension at the property of 4.6 metres in depth. However, the additional side extension would add more bulk to an extension that already surpasses what is generally considered acceptable in terms of size and scale for a terraced property. As such, it is considered that the additional side extension element would add further bulk to the extension and would appear out of scale and proportion in relation to the main original dwelling, detrimental to the character and appearance of the architectural integrity of the host property.

The existing terrace including the appeal property is asymmetrical in appearance, with consistent, uniform building lines. It is noted that the extension is set back from the main front wall of the host property. However, given that the host property is an end of terrace property located on the junction with Siward Road, it is in a highly prominent and visible location, the side extension would appear as a visually discordant and incongruous element in relation the surrounding area and its characteristic pattern of development. Therefore, the side extension would result in harm to and would not preserve the character and appearance of the Tower Gardens Conservation Area.

It is noted that concerns have been raised in relation to the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension. However, it is considered that this element could be controlled by way of condition if the LPA were minded to approve the application.

The proposal is contrary to policies 7.4 ‘Local Character’, 7.6 ‘Heritage Assets and Archaeology’ of the London Plan (2016), CSV5 ‘Alterations and Extensions in Conservations Areas’ ‘Design’, Policy UD3 ‘General Principles’ of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (saved policies 2006) and Policy DM12 of the Development Management DPD.

6.2 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

The London Plan (2016) Policy 7.6 *Architecture* states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. UDP (2006) 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 (2015) 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.

Given the presence of an existing single storey rear extension, and that the side extension would face onto Siward Road, the proposed development is not considered to have a material adverse impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

6.3 Conclusions

- The proposed development due to its size, design and siting would result in an overly prominent and dominant feature within the street and would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. It would therefore fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted 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

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Registered No. HGY/2016/2575

Applicant's drawing No.(s) HC-01, HC-02, HC-03, HC-04, HC-05, HC-06 & HC-07

Subject to the following condition(s)

The unauthorised rear extension by reason of its size, scale and design results in a dominant and incongruous form of development that fails to achieve sufficient subordination from the host dwelling and is contrary to policies SP11 'Design', UD3 'General Principles', CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas', 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' and Policy DM12 of the Development Management DPD.

The extension detracts from the historical architectural integrity of the host dwelling and fails to enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area in general. As such the development is contrary to Policies 7.4 'Local Character', 7.6 'Heritage Assets and Archaeology' of the London Plan (2016), CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservations Areas' 'Design', Policy UD3 'General Principles' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (saved policies 2006) and Policy DM12 of the Development Management DPD.