

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/2638
Type	Full planning permission
Location	4, View Close, London, N6 4DD
Proposal	Erection of single storey front porch extension (AMENDED PLANS).
Case Officer	Mercy Oruwari
Valid Date	22/09/2022
Applicant	Jenny Bramley
Agent	Mr Owain Williams

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the erection of single storey front porch extension, which has been amended during the application process.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is a semi-detached dwelling located in View Close. The close is a 1960s housing development arranged in a cul-de-sac located on the south side of View Road between Grange Road and Denewood Road. The houses have open front gardens and an overall strong unity in relation to the design and appearances of the respective properties including No 4, which sits on a small plot within the close. It is slightly stepped back from the adjacent property at No 2.

3.3 No 4 has been previously altered by way of a new entrance porch and a single storey side extension. The site is located within the Highgate conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.4 The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows.

- HGY/2021/2939 - Erection of two-storey front bay extension and erection of loft dormer extension. Refused
- HGY/2013/0960 - Demolition of existing side extension buildings, garage and entrance porch, and erection of new side extension and entrance porch (Householder application). Granted
- OLD/1973/1822 - Erection of two-storey extension to front of property to house spiral staircase, entrance hall & enlarged bathroom. Granted

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

1) LBH Conservation Officer: - Concerns raised in relation to plans as initially submitted; namely manner in which the extension would alter the original design of the principal façade, impact on the staggered nature of the properties and their landscaping. Concerns that the vertical cladding would detract from the principal façade.

(Comment: The scheme was amended during the application process, to simplify the design, namely the vertical cladding removed and replaced with painted brickwork and soft landscaping included in the updated ground floor plan. As amended the extension would sit comfortably within the site and have an appearance which does not visually compete with the host property; rather it would reflect/ reinforce the appearance of the original ground floors to No 4 and No 2. The combination of its simple design, being tucked-in and not projecting forward of the building line to No 2 with vegetation surrounding such a structure mean that this will not be a visually prominent feature within the streetscene).

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 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: 2

Objecting: 1

Supporting: 1 neighbour

5.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee

5.3 The following issues raised in the representation:

- Heavy, deep black fascia to the unfortunate side extension and porch roof, previously approved and built, is uncharacteristic of and damaging to this group of houses;
- Frameless windows are out of scale with the neighbouring properties and fail to respect the original design intent;
- Extension forward of the building line of No. 2 is unsympathetic to the scale and layout of the original design/ impact on the conservation area;
- Fibre cement panels have no precedent from the original design and materiality of View Close, have an industrial appearance;
- Stacked bricks to the proposed enlarged hall are not a feature of the original design;
- Scheme overall would cause harm to the conservation area.

(Officer Comment: The concerns of Highgate CAAC in relation to the siting and materiality of the extension were noted. As noted above the extension has been amended to ensure a more sympathetic design and materiality, rather than one which competes with the original appearance to the property through the introduction of new materials as initially proposed).

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

5.2 DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings 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.

5.3 London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

5.4 DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH2 is also relevant, specifically requirement development proposals, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate's conservation area.

5.5 Permission is sought for a ground floor front extension that will accommodate a relocated lobby and a new studio room. The main entrance door would be moved to the side of the new structure, and a floor to ceiling fixed metal framed window be installed to the front. On the other side of the extension adjacent to No 2 a frameless corner window will be installed.

5.6 The height of the extension would be marginally higher than the current white painted brick base which is a feature to Nos 2 & 4. The extension will sit forward of the building line of the host property but would only span two-thirds of its width. Although a feature of these two properties is a stepped arrangement, the siting of such an extension here does not in itself mean that this is still not readily apparent. The matching upper floors which are faced in hanging shingles' would still be readily visible as being stepped. The introduction of a small extension here tucked in and not projecting forward of the building line of No 2 is not viewed to be harmful, particularly also as views of such an extension are restricted/ softened by the presence of shrubs/plants within the landscaped front garden.

5.7 The initial proposed material of fibre cement cladding with aluminium coping has been revised and changed to white painted brickwork to reflect the appearance of the original house. A simple white painted brick addition will sit comfortably in relation to the white plinth, a feature to the application property and No 2.

5.8 Overall, while the frontage to this property at ground floor level would undergo an element of change, within the context of this estate where there are variations in detail, fenestration, materials and appearance at ground floor level, such a feature would not be a highly discernible feature, as such meaning the character and appearance of this estate/ that of the conservation area would be left preserved.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

5.9 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.

5.10 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.

5.11 The siting of such an extension will not affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

5.12 The proposal as amended is considered acceptable in terms of design, heritage and amenity.

5.13 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

6. 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.

7. 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 unless otherwise stated within the approved plans in CONDITION ST05 - Approved Plans - Standard.

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:

- The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-
8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday
and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

- The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.