

Officer's Opinion



Case Number	HGY/2022/2715
Type	Full planning permission
Location	115, Victoria Road, London, N22 7XG
Proposal	Replacement of single storey partial infill extension with a full depth extension. Creation of rear dormer and roof extension including the insertion of 1x front and 1x rear rooflights, and formation of a small roof terrace.
Case Officer	Mercy Oruwari
Review Date	29 November 2022
Applicant	M T Cant
Agent	Sophie Frykfors von Hekkel

Opinion

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the replacement of single storey partial infill extension with a full depth extension. Creation of rear dormer and roof extension including the insertion of 1x front and 1x rear rooflights, and formation of a small roof terrace.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is a two-storey mid terrace property with a double storey bay window at the front and a double storey deep rear outrigger. The front gardens on this side of the road are sloped. The garden at the host property has been terraced with four levelled tiers stepping down towards the street. The site is not located in a conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.3 The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows:

- HGY/2021/2915 - Erection of single storey infill extension, dormer and roof extension including a roof terrace, insertion of 1 front rooflight and associated interior and front landscaping alterations including refuse and recycling storage. Refused

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 There were no internal or external responses sought

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 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: 0

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;

Design and appearance

6.2 DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' 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 building, 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. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

6.3 The proposed dormer is wider than what would normally be deemed acceptable; however, a precedent has been set within the street to which the full width rear dormer will be in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development that can be found within the area. The depth of the terrace has been significantly reduced in size, so when combined with the L shaped dormer both can be considered to be proportionate and subordinate to the roof.

6.4 The proposal also includes the replacement of the flat roof single storey partial infill with a pitched roofed full depth infill. The extension would infill the gap between the host property and the boundary of No.113. The structure would pitch down from 2.9m in height to 2.5m along the boundary. This will reduce any potential impacts for the neighbour. The depth of the infill would also be acceptable, as it will not project beyond the rear of the building. Due to its scale, depth, rear mid-terrace location it would not be visible from surrounding public vantage points.

6.5 The proposal overall is considered proportionate and subordinate to the host building and therefore, the local character and visual amenity of the area will be protected

Impact on neighbouring amenity

6.6 London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

6.7 DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

6.8 The proposed dormer would not result in any significant increase in overshadowing, loss of outlook or appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties. The infill extension at 2.5m on the boundary of No 113 is acceptable in comparison with the permitted development allowance of 3m. As the extension is quite modest there will be no material loss of sunlight or daylight and it should not have an overbearing appearance to the neighbouring property.

6.9 The proposed terrace area would comprise of an obscured glassed privacy screen on the side of at least 1.7m in height and 1m on the rear facing screen. Given the angle of views to the closest neighbouring windows and No 113 roof terrace, the proposed use of the terrace area, like the dormer, would not give rise to easy views toward or into neighbouring private amenity areas or habitable rooms significantly over and above the existing site circumstances.

6.10 Given the modest size of the terrace, being unable to accommodate large groups of people, the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. Overall, the proposal is acceptable in amenity terms

Conclusion

6.11 The proposal is considered acceptable.

6.12 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 the following condition(s)

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

-
-
-