

## SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT – ITEMS B1 AND B2 PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE A OF 6/1/2011

<b>Proposed Development At:</b> 1, Alwyne Road, Islington, London, N1 2HH	<b>LBI Application Ref:</b> P102451 / P102242
---	--

### **Additional Consultation Responses**

1. Following completion of the committee report two additional responses were received. The grounds raised are as follows:
  - The mass of the extension is too great, and it would adversely affect the whole character of the area.
  - The building proposed is too big.
  - Materials chosen are not compatible to the local area (brick, rather than stucco should be used). Obscured glazing is not appropriate to domestic architecture.
  - The access between the house and the library would block views of green and open spaces.
  - The existing brick wall should be removed because it blocks views of green spaces and would no longer be needed if the garage were to be removed.
  - The drawings do not accurately represent the existing situation, or the proposed relationship to ground conditions and levels.
  - The timing of the recommendation for approval compared to the end of the consultation period.
2. The Tree Officer has now proposed a condition.

### **EVALUATION**

3. A number of the points raised are similar to those raised previously and these are addressed in the main report. These include the first 3 bullet points which are dealt with in paragraphs 15-17 of the main report.

### **Conservation and Design**

4. In addition to those points raised previously the issue of blocking views of green and open spaces has been raised. The main report refers to policy D26 and its advice that side extensions will not be permitted where existing spaces between properties is important to the character of the area. It is acknowledged that that in this area the spaces between properties *are* important. However, the presence of the garage is a consideration and the principle of a side extension is therefore not objected to.
5. The comments refer to the gap currently between the garage and the house, which is 2.1m. Level with the rear of the garage is a wooden fence and there are some views over the top of a tree in the rear garden and other vegetation. In front there is some shrubbery. The issue is whether this is sufficient to be preserved. The height of the rear extension is similar to the existing garage. It is slightly wider and so this width, on top of the glazed link, is considered to represent the issue.
6. The current situation allows some views (although they are only really glimpses) of greenery in the rear garden. It is certainly not an open view. The large tree would

remain visible over the top of the proposed extension and although there would be less greenery visible what is there now is not considered significant enough to warrant refusal.

7. One objection notes that were the garage to be removed that the existing brick wall would no longer be required and could be removed so unblocking views of the space beyond. There is no proposal to demolish the garage without a replacement structure and given that it offers useful space, whether that be for a car or general storage, it seems highly unlikely that its removal would be proposed. Even if it were then the owner would no doubt want to preserve their privacy and would propose some form of boundary treatment. Therefore, it is not expected that significant views of the rear gardens will be achieved.

### **Trees**

8. The proposed works would not involve any removal or pruning of existing trees. However, the tree officer has noted the proximity to four mature trees; one in the front garden and three to the rear. The following condition is to ensure that they are adequately protected during construction:

*CONDITION: Prior to the development commencing, a defined Tree Protection Plan (TPP) needs to be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The TPP needs to indicate the trees that are to be protected in accordance with BS 5837: 2005 'Trees in Relation to Construction' by the erection of protective hoarding. The hoarding shall consist of a rigid, exterior grade ply high sterling board. For the duration of the demolition and construction work no access to this hoarded off area is to be permitted without the express written authority of the local planning authority. No materials, chemicals or noxious substances are to be stored or used within this hoarded off area. No plant, machinery, digging vehicles, to be allowed within the hoarded area or under the canopy spread of the tree, for the period of any demolition or construction activities on site. The soil within the canopy spread of the trees must also be protected from compaction.*

*REASON: To avoid inappropriate excavations and damage to the retained tree, ensuring that disturbance to the roots of the tree is minimised and to maintain a healthy rooting area to ensure the long term health of the tree thereby its contribution to the amenity of the locality. To protect the health and stability of the tree, and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained in accordance with policy 3D.15 of the London Plan 2008 and policy Env6 of the Islington UDP 2002.*

### **Other Matters**

9. The quality of the drawings has been questioned. Having viewed the site with the plans it is considered that they are sufficiently accurate to enable a full assessment of the proposal. They provide the extent of information that would typically be provided with a planning application, and if anything are of a better quality than many submissions.
10. Finally, a concern has been raised that the recommendation of approval came before the end of the consultation period. There was some confusion about when the end of the consultation period was, caused by the listed building consent and full planning application having different consultation dates. This was unfortunate but more

importantly no decision was made. Neighbours were given the full 3 weeks in which to respond and their concerns have now been reported to the committee.