

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4015
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	114, Rosebery Avenue, Tottenham, London, N17 9SB
Proposal	Erection of a single storey wrap-around extension to the rear of the property.
Case Officer	Sabelle Adjagboni
Valid Date	08/12/2022
Applicant	Mr Neil Mersh
Agent	Mr Nicholas Papalexandrakos

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Conditions:

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision.
- 2) In accordance with approved plans

Informatives:

- 1) Land ownership
- 2) Hours of construction
- 3) Party Wall Act

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development.

This is an application for a single storey wrap-around extension.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey terraced house. It is not in a conservation area nor is it a listed building.

Rear extensions are very common on Rosebery Avenue, and in the same lot as the application site. Nos. 104 and 122 are of relevance as they have a rear and side extension, and a wraparound extension respectively.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

There is no recent planning history in relation to the site.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 5 letters. No representations were received.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity

Design and appearance

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.

The proposed extension extends 2.7m beyond the existing rear elevation. As it is a wraparound extension, at the side, it infills the whole width of the original house and extends 5.8m to end on the same line as the rear extension giving the back of the building a uniform appearance.

The proposal has a ridge height of 3.3m on the boundary with No. 116 and on the other side the proposal drops this height by sloping down the roof to 2.5m on the boundary with No. 112. Given the modest depth, the overall scale of the extension is considered to be proportional and subordinate to the host building.

Additionally, the proposed materials will match the existing where applicable. Therefore, the proposal does not undermine the existing uniformity of the building.

As such, the proposal is considered in line with the above policies.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

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.

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.

The height of 3.3m on the boundary proposed on the boundary with No. 116 is only 300mm above their rear extension. Additionally, the proposed extension does not go deeper than the rear extension at 116. Therefore, the proposal will have a negligible impact on their daylight or sense of enclosure.

On the boundary with 112, the extension is deeper and extends by 5.8m. However, to mitigate the impact, the roof height has been reduced to 2.5m. It is acknowledged that there is a ground floor window in the flank wall of the neighbours outrigger that would face towards the side elevation of the proposed extension. However, this window already looks towards the two storey side elevation of the applicants outrigger and so already has a relatively limited outlook. The reduced height of the proposed extension along the boundary means that the outlook from this window will not be significantly worse than the existing situation. The room this window serves also benefits from a window in the end elevation of the outrigger. The window at the base of the neighbours side return already has its outlook restricted by the flank walls of their own and the properties application two-storey outriggers. The proposal is not considered to further reduce this windows outlook to a degree that would be materially harmful. The proposal is therefore not considered to have a materially harmful impact act on the outlook, sense of enclosure and daylight of the neighbours at 112.

As such, the proposal is considered in line with the above policies.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

CIL APPLICABLE

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sqm. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions.

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.

Informatives:

- **INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership**
The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.
- **INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act**
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.
- **INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work**
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.