



PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE B  
Date: 22 January 2013

AGENDA ITEM NO: B11  
NON-EXEMPT

Application number	P121460
Application type	Householder
Ward	Canonbury
Listed building	Locally Listed Grade B
Conservation area	Canonbury
Development Plan context	N/A
Licensing Implications	None
Site Address	3 Grange Grove, N1 2NP
Proposal	Construction of full width rear ground floor extension and half width first floor rear extension, enlargement of dormer on rear roof pitch, replacement of existing front parking space with landscaped area and reinstatement of front boundary wall.

Case Officer	Tobias Finlayson
Applicant	Mr and Mrs Miles and Sarah McCarthy
Agent	Lipton Plant Architects

## 1. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 The Committee is asked to resolve to **GRANT** planning permission:

3.1.1. for the reasons for approval; and

3.1.2. subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

## 2. SITE PLAN (site outlined in red)



## 3. PHOTOS OF SITE/STREET

3.1 Front elevation (east facing) of application site viewed from adjoining footpath.





3.2 Rear elevation (west facing) of application site viewed from rear garden.



3.3 Looking towards ground floor rear extension roofs from first floor window of application site.



- 3.4 Rear elevation (west facing) of adjoining site (1 Grange Grove) viewed from rear garden.



- 3.5 Looking towards rear elevations (west facing) from glass-roofed ground floor rear extension of adjoining property (1 Grange Grove).



## 4. SUMMARY

- 4.1 This application is for construction of a full width rear ground floor extension and half width first floor rear extension, enlargement of dormer on rear roof pitch, replacement of existing front parking space with landscaped area and reinstatement of front boundary wall.
- 4.2 The proposal has been amended since originally submitted so that the part width first floor rear extension is now smaller in height and depth in order to overcome neighbouring amenity concerns.
- 4.3 The main issues arising from this application are the impact on the character and appearance of the building, terrace and surrounding conservation area and the impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

## 5. SITE AND SURROUNDING

- 5.1 The application relates to a 3 storey mid-terrace, single dwelling house located on the western side of Grange Grove to the north of the intersection with Canonbury Place. The property, although not statutorily listed, is locally listed (Grade B) and within the Canonbury Conservation Area.
- 5.2 The surrounding area is characterised by predominantly residential properties of similar design, scale and age.

## 6. PROPOSAL (IN DETAIL)

- 6.1 Permission is sought for construction of a full width rear ground floor extension and half width first floor rear extension, enlargement of dormer roof extension on rear roof pitch, replacement of existing front parking space with landscaped area and reinstatement of front boundary wall.

### Revision:

- 6.2 The application has been amended following officer concerns regarding potential impact on the adjoining property, 1 Grange Grove. The amendments have reduced the overall bulk and scale of the first floor rear extension as its depth has been reduced by 0.9 metres and its height reduced by 0.5 metres.

## 7. RELEVANT HISTORY

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- 7.1 **March 2008:** Planning permission (Ref: P073088) granted for *Two storey rear extension, addition of dormer to rear roofslope, erection of front gate and railings and alterations to front garden/parking area.*
- 7.2 **June 2007:** Planning application (Ref: P071023) refused for *Demolition of existing rear extension, part excavation of rear garden (approximately 1m) and erection of rear extension at ground and first floor levels. Removal of existing dormer window to rear and insertion of larger dormer. Insertion of roof lights to front. Erection of gate and front railings to front of property and alterations to front garden/parking area. New brick flue to rear to house rear down pipes,* refused on the following grounds:

- *The roof lights to the front elevation would be visible from the public realm and would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and wider Conservation Area. This is contrary to policies D1, D4, D11, D22, and D42 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan (2002) and the Canonbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002).*
- *The treatment of the rear elevation is considered unacceptable. In particular, the enlargement of the dormer window is excessive, and the proposals would result in a loss of the existing long window to the staircase which is considered a valuable feature of the house. The proposal is considered contrary to policies D1, D4, D11, D22, D28 and D42 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan (2002) and the Canonbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002).*
- *The design of the front railings is considered unacceptable due to them not being individually set into the stone coping and the presence of piers. This is considered contrary to D1, D4, D11, D22, and D42 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan (2002) and the Canonbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002).*

7.3 **July 1999:** Certificate of Lawfulness (Ref: 990861) granted for *Proposed construction of a single storey rear extension to form full width extension with existing rear extension.*

## **8. CONSULTATION**

### **Public Consultation**

8.1 Letters were sent to occupants of adjoining at Grange Grove and St Mary's Grove on 25 July 2012. Both a site notice and press advert were also displayed on 26 July 2012. Following receipt of revised plans, occupants of adjoining properties were also re-consulted on the 29 October 2012. The public consultation of the application therefore expired on 12 November 2012, however it is the Council's practice to continue to consider representations made up until the date of a decision.

8.2 At the time of writing this report a single response had been received from the public with regard to the application. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of natural light;
- Undue sense of enclosure;
- Tunnelling effect; and
- Detrimental effect on living conditions.

### **Internal Consultees**

8.3 English Heritage: the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

### **Internal Consultees**

8.4 Conservation and Design Officer: States no objection to the proposal subsequent to it having been amended and subject to conditions.

8.5 The Conservation and Design Officer has requested that should permission be granted, that conditions be imposed in the existing staircase window be carefully removed, stored and re-instated; that all bricks used match those existing; all new pointing should be a

lime mortar (1:3 lime/sand mix) and the pointing profile should be a flush or brushed profile - weatherstruck pointing is unacceptable and the brick window arch and the window reveal of the staircase window should accurately reflect the original arch and be reinstated using a lime based mortar.

## **9. RELEVANT POLICIES**

**DETAILS OF ALL RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDANCE NOTES ARE ATTACHED IN APPENDIX 2. THIS REPORT CONSIDERS THE PROPOSAL AGAINST THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS.**

### **National Guidance**

- 9.1 The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 seeks to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations. The NPPF is a material consideration and has been taken into account as part of the assessment of these proposals.

### **Development Plan**

- 9.2 The Development Plan is comprised of the London Plan 2011, Islington Core Strategy 2011 and Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002.

### **Emerging Policy Documents**

- 9.3 Islington's Development Management Policies – Proposed Submission, October 2011.

### **Designations**

- 9.4 The site is not subject to any designations.

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)/Document (SPD)**

- 9.5 The SPG's and/or SPD's that are considered relevant are listed in Appendix 2.

## **10. ASSESSMENT**

- 10.1 The main issues arising from this proposal relate to:

- Impact on the character and appearance of the building, terrace and surrounding conservation area; and
- Impact on neighbouring residential amenities.

### **Design, Conservation and Heritage Considerations**

- 10.2 The principle of a full width ground floor, part width first floor and dormer extensions to the rear elevation as well as front garden alterations have been considered acceptable at the property on design, conservation and heritage grounds with the granting of the previous planning permission in 2008. In addition, it is noted that both adjoining properties (1 and 5 Grange Grove) have full width ground floor and part width first floor rear extensions and therefore, this proposal is reflecting such.



## **Neighbouring Amenity**

- 10.3 The principle of full width ground floor, part width first floor and dormer extensions to the rear elevation at the application site have been considered acceptable with regard to neighbouring residential amenity with the granting of the previous planning permission (Council reference P073088) in 2008. The 2008 permission approved a part width first floor rear extension measuring 3.6 metres deep and 1.7 metres high above the adjoining party wall with 1 Grange Grove.
- 10.4 Despite the previous planning permission, which was not implemented, there was both officer concern and neighbour objection regarding the potential impact of the part width first floor rear extension on the residential amenities of the occupiers of 1 Grange Grove. As a result the applicant has substantially reduced the bulk and scale of the part width first floor rear extension compared to that originally submitted as well as that previously approved in 2008. The current application originally measured 3.9 metres deep and 2.5 metres high (above the party wall with No.1) and now measures 3.2 metres deep and 1.9 metres high above the party wall. For ease of comparison and to have a fixed measuring point given the floor level differences between the originally submitted and subsequently amended current application and the 2008 permission, the height of the extension has been taken from the top of the party wall with No.1 (although it will be incorporated into the extension). It is noted that the current application also proposes to remove the remaining section of party wall with No.1 at first floor level that measures 3.3 metres deep and 0.6 metres high resulting in less bulk on the boundary and therefore an improvement over the current environment with regard to sense of enclosure and loss of light.
- 10.5 It is noted that the first floor rear extension has been moved closer to the adjoining property to the south, being on the boundary with 1 Grange Grove. However, with regard to the first floor bedroom window of 1 Grange Grove, the proposed first floor rear extension complies in elevation with the Building Research Establishment's *Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A Guide to Good Practice* and is therefore considered not to result in such a loss of light or increased sense of enclosure as to warrant refusal of the application. With regard to the potential impact on the ground floor glassed roof extension at the adjoining property (1 Grange Grove), bearing in mind that planning permission has been previously granted for a larger extension, the significant reduction in both height and depth has resulted in a proposed extension that no longer causes an unacceptable loss of light or increased sense of enclosure, particularly given that the neighbouring property is due south.

## **11. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

### **Summary**

- 11.1 Overall, the proposal to construct a full width rear ground floor extension and half width first floor rear extension, enlargement of dormer on rear roof pitch, replacement of existing front parking space with landscaped area and reinstatement of front boundary wall is considered acceptable.

### **Conclusion**

- 11.2 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions for the reasons and details as set out in Appendix 1: RECOMMENDATIONS.



## APPENDIX 1: RECOMMENDATIONS

### RECOMMENDATION A

That if members are minded to approve this proposal, officers recommend that the following summary forms the **reasons for grant** to be published on the decision notice:

This proposal has been approved following consideration of all the relevant policies in the Development Plan (London Plan 2011, Islington Core Strategy 2011 and Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002), the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and other material considerations.

- This decision was made by the Members of the Planning Sub-Committee on the 22 January 2013;
- The delivery of this scheme would be consistent with the broad aims of the NPPF and its presumption in favour of sustainable development that supports economic growth but also seeks to ensure social and environmental progress;
- The proposal is considered to be acceptable in overall design and not to have a material adverse visual impact on the character and appearance of the host building, terrace and the surrounding Canonbury Conservation Area and is considered consistent with policies 3.4 (Optimising housing potential), 7.4 (Local character), 7.6 (Architecture) and 7.8 (Heritage assets and archaeology) of the London Plan 2011, policies CS8 (Enhancing Islington's Character) and CS9 (Protecting and Enhancing Islington's Built and Historic Environment) of the Islington Core Strategy 2011, policies D3 (Site Planning), D4 (Designing in Context), D8 (Boundary Walls, Paving and Street Furniture), D11 (Extensions and Alterations), D22 (New Development), D24 (Materials), D25 (Roof Extensions), D28 (Rear Extensions) and D42 (Buildings on the Local List) of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002, sections 2.4.3 (Rooflines with Existing Alterations/Extensions) and 2.5 (Residential Rear Extensions) of the Islington Urban Design Guide 2006 and policies DM1 (Design) and DM3 (Heritage) of the emerging Development Management Policies 2012; and
- The proposal is not considered to have a significant adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and is considered consistent with policy D3 (Site Planning) of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002, section 1.6 (Extensions and Additions to Dwellings) of the planning Standards Guidelines 2002 and policy DM1 (Design) of the emerging Development Management Policies 2012.

### RECOMMENDATION B

That the grant of planning permission be subject to **conditions** to secure the following:

#### List of Conditions:

<b>1</b>	<b>Commencement</b>
	CONDITION: The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.  REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Chapter 5).

<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>Approved Plans List</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>Design and Access Statement dated June 2012; Ordnance Survey; 279.(1).0.001 Rev B; 279.(1).0.002 Rev B; 279.(1).0.003 Rev B; 279.(1).0.004 Rev B; 279.(1).0.005 Rev B; 279.(1).1.001 Rev I; 279.(1).1.002 Rev E; 279.(1).2.001 Rev A; 279.(1).2.002 Rev J; 279.(1).3.001 Rev H</p> <p>REASON: To comply with Section 70(1)(a) of the Town and Country Act 1990 as amended and the Reason for Grant and also for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.</p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Materials to Match</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The facing materials of the extensions and alterations hereby approved shall match the existing building in terms of colour, texture, appearance and architectural detailing and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the appearance of the building is acceptable in accordance with policies: 5.3; 7.4; 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, policies: D4, D11 and D24 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002 and policies: CS9A, B and G and CS10F of the Islington Core Strategy 2011.</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Existing Rear Staircase Window</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The existing rear staircase window shall be carefully removed, stored and re-instated prior to occupation of the extensions hereby approved.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the appearance of the building is acceptable in accordance with policies: 5.3; 7.4; 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, policies: D4, D11 and D24 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002 and policies: CS9A, B and G and CS10F of the Islington Core Strategy 2011.</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Pointing</b></p> <p>CONDITION: All new pointing shall be a lime based mortar (1:3 lime/sand mix) and the pointing profile shall be flush or brushed profile and shall be maintained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the appearance of the building is acceptable in accordance with policies: 5.3; 7.4; 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, policies: D4, D11 and D24 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002 and policies: CS9A, B and G and CS10F of the Islington Core Strategy 2011.</p>
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Rear Staircase Window Arch and Reveal</b></p> <p>CONDITION: The brick window arch and the window reveal of the rear staircase window shall accurately reflect the original arch and be re-instated using a lime based mortar (1:3 lime/sand mix).</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the appearance of the building is acceptable in accordance with policies: 5.3; 7.4; 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, policies: D4, D11 and D24 of the Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002 and policies: CS9A, B and G and CS10F of the Islington Core Strategy 2011.</p>

**List of Informatives:**

<b>6</b>	<b>Permission granted, No pre-application, Amendments undertaken to comply with established guidance</b>
	<p>To assist applicants in a positive manner, the Local Planning Authority has produced policies and written guidance, all of which is available on the Council's website.</p> <p>A pre-application advice service is also offered and encouraged. Whilst this wasn't taken up by the applicant, and although the scheme did not comply with guidance on receipt, the LPA acted in a proactive manner offering suggested improvements to the scheme (during application processing) to secure compliance with policies and written guidance. These were incorporated into the scheme by the applicant.</p> <p>This resulted in a scheme that accords with policy and guidance as a result of positive, proactive and collaborative working between the applicant, and the LPA during the application stages, with the decision issued in a timely manner in accordance with the NPPF.</p>

## **APPENDIX 2: RELEVANT POLICIES**

This appendix lists all relevant development plan policies and guidance notes pertinent to the determination of this planning application.

### **1. National Guidance**

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 seeks to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations. The NPPF is a material consideration and has been taken into account as part of the assessment of these proposals.

### **2. Development Plan**

The Development Plan is comprised of the London Plan 2011, Islington Core Strategy 2011 and Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002. The following policies of the Development Plan are considered relevant to this application:

#### **A) The London Plan 2011 - Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London**

3 London's people:

Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential

7 London's living places and spaces:

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.6 Architecture

Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

#### **B) Islington Core Strategy 2011**

Spatial Strategy:

Policy CS8 (Enhancing Islington's Character)

Strategic Policies:

Policy CS9 (Protecting and Enhancing Islington's Built and Historic Environment)

#### **C) Islington Unitary Development Plan 2002**

Conservation and Design Policies:

D3 (Site Planning)

D4 (Designing in Context)

D8 (Boundary Walls, Paving and Street Furniture)

D11 (Alterations and Extensions)

D22 (New Development)

D24 (Materials)

D25 (Roof Extensions)

D28 (Rear Extensions)

D42 (Buildings on the Local List)



### 3. **Emerging Policy Documents**

#### A) **Islington's Development Management Policies – Proposed Submission, October 2011**

The Proposed Submission of Islington's *Development Management Policies* went out to consultation in October 2011 and this process was completed on 12 December 2011. Following this amended drafts of these documents were produced and a further round of public consultation commenced on 8th May 2012. The final draft of this document has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for Independent Examination. The document, whilst not adopted, gives an indication of the Council's approach to sustainable development proposals for the next 15 years. The emerging policies are a material planning consideration.

Design and Heritage:

DM1 Design

DM3 Heritage

### 4. **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)/Document (SPD)**

The following SPG's and/or SPD's are relevant:

#### **Islington UDP**

Conservation Area Design Guidelines

Planning Standards Guidelines

Urban Design Guide