

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0731
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	2 & 4 Wellington Avenue, Tottenham, London, N15 6AS
Proposal	Erection of a type 3 loft extension together with a first floor rear extension across number 2 and 4 Wellington Avenue
Case Officer	Sarah Madondo
Valid Date	15/03/2023
Applicant	Heshy Friedman
Agent	Mr. Heshy Friedman

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Proposed development

Erection of a type 3 loft extension together with a first floor rear extension across number 2 and 4 Wellington Avenue.

Site and Surroundings

This is joint application for the erection of type-3 roof extension, as detailed in the South Tottenham SPD. This involves the continuation of the front elevation to create a second floor. The frontage would have a parapet wall that would continue around either flank elevation. The materials indicated on the plans would be an identical match to those of the existing building with new brickwork. The proposal also includes the erection of first floor extensions to no 2 & 4 Wellington Avenue.

Principle of development

The application is joint application for the erection of Type 3 extension to no. 2 & 4 Wellington Avenue. The application site is located within the designated area identified in Haringey SPD 'House Extension in South Tottenham' (2013). The SPD provides additional guidance on the design of house extensions being built to meet the need for providing additional habitable accommodation for large families in this part of the borough. The SPD sought to provide clear and consistent guidance on the form of roof extension defining three approved ways in which homes may be approved at roof level. This proposal is for the erection of Type 3 second floor extensions and given its location, the principle of this type of extension is acceptable subject to the design detailing.

Design and appearance

The site is a pair of terraced dwellings in a row of properties on Wellington Avenue. The area surrounding the site is residential, defined by liner rows of terraced properties backing on to one another, separated by small rear gardens. The character of the properties is varied, particularly along the rear elevation where a range of alterations are visible. However, the properties on this terrace share a clear consistency, and an element of symmetry, in their design and form. Immediate properties on Clifton Gardens also have a pleasing sense of uniformity at first floor level.

The proposal includes the erection of joint first floor extensions. The first floor extension at no. 2 Wellington Avenue would full width approximately 6.3 metres wide at 2.5 metres deep and the extension at no. 4 would be half the width of the house approximately 3 metres wide and 2.5 deep with a pitched roofs. Officers considered that the full width extension at 6.3 metres wide would introduce addition that would be disproportionate to the extension at no. 4 which has an extension which is only half a width and generously setback from the boundary. Also given that this a joint application introducing a full width extension would unbalance the two projections as result would be out of character and odd with the rest of the terrace, particularly the projection at the end of terrace would stand out in isolation. The proposed first floor full width extension would appear dominate given its size and would set some unwanted precedents. The proposed full width extension would create a more notable disruption in this regard, appearing as an out of place and visually jarring feature. Notwithstanding the use of matching materials, the shallow pitch and the proposal would result in the first-floor element of the proposed extension that would be unsympathetic to the design and proportions of 2 & 4 Wellington Avenue.

Overall, the proposed full width first floor rear extensions, given its scale, design, along with its projection at first floor level, the proposal would not reflect the design characteristics or detailing of the host dwellings and would not appear subordinate to them. As such, the proposed first floor extensions would appear as an incongruous and visually obtrusive addition to the rear of this terrace.

The applicant has referred to planning permission granted under appeal at (12-16 Clifton Gardens) for first floor rear extensions. However, these properties have a more generous set back from outer side boundaries so as to not appear unduly dominant and would not be visual prominent when viewed from the rear garden of the properties on Craven Park Road. In addition, officers would highlight that the properties on Wellington Avenue have very short gardens compared to the appeal site at no. 12-16 Clifton Gardens, where there is adequate separation between the first-floor extension and the dwellings to the rear. Furthermore, there are a number of acceptable joint first floor extensions in the surrounding area, creating effectively a traditional outrigger such as at No. 1 and 3 Clifton Gardens directly to the rear of the site and No. 50 and 52 Fairview Road flanking the site. It should also be noted that No. 37 and 39 Clifton Gardens was very recently refused a full width first floor rear extension, for the reasons set out above. Ultimately however, it is important to point out that each scheme is decided on its own site-specific circumstances and reference to development elsewhere carries little weight.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Given that no. 2 is end of terrace and given that the first extension at no. 4 would be setback it is considered that the amenities of the neighbouring properties would not be harmed. In relation to the type 3 extensions, given the separation distance, the additional floor would not have a significant impact on privacy nor would it have any harm on daylight/sunlight of the neighbouring properties to the rear. There would be no significant harm to the amenities of the adjacent occupiers, as the proposal extends upwards only and within the existing footprint of the host building.

Conclusion

The proposed full width first floor level extension to the rear of these properties would, by reason of their design, size, and massing appear overly bulky, awkward and incongruous additions to the rear of the houses, out of keeping with rest of the terrace in which they are located and with the terrace to the rear to the harming the character and appearance of the area and detrimental to neighbouring visual amenities. As such, the proposal would be contrary to contrary to and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM1

and DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and the advice contained within the House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document adopted in 2013.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed full width first floor level extension to the rear of these properties would, by reason of their design, size, and massing appear overly bulky, awkward and incongruous additions to the rear of the houses, out of keeping with rest of the terrace in which they are located and with the terrace to the rear to the harming the character and appearance of the area and detrimental to neighbouring visual amenities. As such, the proposal would be contrary to and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM1 and DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and the advice contained within the House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document adopted in 2013.