

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0304
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	Ground Floor Flat A, 7 Waldegrave Road, Wood Green, London, N8 0QA
Proposal	Addition to the existing rear single storey extension to the ground floor flat
Case Officer	Zara Seelig
Valid Date	30/01/2023
Applicant	Reel and Nejc Ahmed and Haberman
Agent	mr Tobias Jaekle

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

This is an application for an addition to the existing rear single storey extension to the ground floor flat.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey mid-terraced building consisting of two self contained flats situated on the western side of Waldegrave Road. The site is not located within a conservation area, it is not a listed building and there are no TPO's on the site.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

OLD/1984/1692 - 12/3/84 Conversion into 2 self-contained flats. – Granted permission
HGY/2015/0753 - Erection of single storey side and rear extension with flat roof design –

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal: None

External: None

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 7 neighbour consultation 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:

Supporting: None

Objecting: None

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- None

The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- None

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 proposal is an overdevelopment of the site, it is not subordinate and appears overly dominant. The proposal exceeds the depth of other single storey rear extensions within the row. The proposal would not be considered acceptable in terms of design.

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.

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 proposal would not impact the neighbouring amenity of attached neighbouring property of no. 5 due to the proposal extending a minimal amount further than the ground floor extension to the outrigger at this address. The proposal would be built right up to the boundary with no. 9, due to its depth and height along this boundary, it would appear overbearing and create a sense of enclosure for the occupants of this property. Other examples of single storey extensions within the row are also set in from shared boundary lines or the roof is pitched, resulting in a lower height along the shared boundary. The proposal would therefore adversely impact the amenities of these neighbouring properties by reason of overbearingness and sense of enclosure.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered unacceptable due to its design and impact on neighbouring amenity and does not comply with relevant planning policies.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused 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 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION:

1. The proposed development would be an overdevelopment of the site by reason of its general bulk and massing within the site, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and policies DM1 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.
2. The proposed development by reason of its depth, height and close proximity to the shared boundary line with no. 9 would be detrimental to the amenities of this neighbouring property, contrary to policies DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and London Plan Policy D6.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development would be an overdevelopment of the site by reason of its general bulk and massing within the site, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and policies DM1 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposed development by reason of its depth, height and close proximity to the shared boundary line with no. 9 would be detrimental to the amenities of this neighbouring property, contrary to policies DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and London Plan Policy D6.

