



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2022/4240
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	21 Eastern Road, Hornsey, London, N2 9LD
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension, installation of rear dormer, installation of rooflights, replacement of windows, re-painting of front elevation, alterations to rear patio area with balustrades, retaining walls and works to rear stairs. Creation of vehicular crossover, provision of new front boundary treatment with replacement gates and rebuilt piers/railings.
Case Officer:	Cameron Sturges
Valid Date:	03/02/2023
Applicant:	Mr K Robinson
Agent:	Mr Rishi Patel

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION, subject to conditions

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 Erection of single storey rear extension, installation of rear dormer, installation of rooflights, replacement of windows, re-painting of front elevation, alterations to rear patio area with balustrades, retaining walls and works to rear stairs. Creation of vehicular crossover, provision of new front boundary treatment with replacement gates and rebuilt piers/railings.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The subject site is a semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the western side of Eastern Road. The property is of mid-Victorian era, built towards the late 19th century. The street scene is residential and characterised by mixed architectural styles.

2.3 The subject site is located within the Fortis Green Conservation Area but does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.4 The planning and enforcement history for the site has been taken into account for this application.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

Internal:

1) LBH Conservation Officer:

- Insufficient information has been provided regarding the special interest of the designated heritage asset and the contribution, if any, the Site makes to that significance.
- There are concerns regarding the scale and design of the proposals.
- The proposed rear dormer appears excessively large and visually overbearing relative to the Site concealing the entirety of the rear roof slope. Coupled with the existing loft extension, it would obscure the architectural composition of the host dwelling and would dominate the rear elevation.
- There are also concerns regarding the proposed rooflights to the street-facing and side roof slopes, both of which are visible from the street; rooflights are incongruous features within Victorian streetscapes and are not considered acceptable in conservation areas. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a precedent for rooflights within the immediate environs of the Site, it is incumbent upon local planning authorities to ensure that negative or intrusive features within conservation areas do not become prevalent, thereby failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- This harm may be mitigated by omitting the front and side rooflights and reducing the width of the proposed dormer and retaining a gap above and below the respective eaves and ridge heights of the main roof. The dormer should not read as a top-heavy and visually dominant addition which subsumes the original roof of the Site, as the proposed dormer would. Rather, it should be subordinate and subservient to the original roof so that the original intended form and architecture remains legible; this would, at a minimum, preserve the character and appearance of the Fortis Green Conservation Area.

2) LBH Transportation:

- The site has a PTAL value of 3, considered 'moderate' access to public transport services. 4 Bus services are accessible within 3 to 8 minutes walk of the site, and East Finchley Underground Station is a 9 minute walk away. The site is also within the Forts Green CPZ, which operates 11.00 to 13.00 Monday to Friday.
- Transportation would object to a new crossover at this location, as it would reduce the amount of on street CPZ bays at this location for existing residents, and create a poorer pedestrian environment by adding a crossover over which vehicle manoeuvres would take place. It would also be contrary to policy DM33 of Haringey's Development Management DPD.
- With regards to making the development more sustainable in transportation terms, it is suggested that given there is spare in the rear garden, a secure/weatherproof cycle store for two cycles is provided as part of the development proposals, to enhance arrangements for the uptake of active and sustainable modes by occupiers.

Officers note that LBH Transportation have provided further comments with respect to the above, stating that the proposed crossover will be subject to a mandatory consultation. Installing a vehicle crossover here would trigger the need to amend an existing Traffic Management Order (TMO), with the full cost of amending both the TMO and changing road markings being needed to be met by the applicants. The applicants must be aware that there could be objections to amending the TMO

due to the loss of on-street car parking and the objections may not be resolved, nor can the granting of planning consent here be taken as to convey certainty that amending the TMO is supported. This is further detailed in the informatives section.

External:

- 1) Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association: No comments received.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of press advert, site notice and 25 letters. No responses were received in response to notification and publicity of the of the application.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

Design, character and appearance of the conservation area

5.2 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.

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. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

Rear extension

5.5 The proposal seeks to add a ground floor extension to the rear of the property above the proposed kitchen extension within the basement. The extension will include a flat biodiverse green roof with dark zinc fascia. Aluminium framed sliding folding/windows and doors are proposed for the north and west elevations with the southern elevation featuring a render to match No.23. The extension will be clad in vertical profiled dark zinc cladding. Glass balustrade is proposed on both sides of the extension.

5.6 The rear extension will be of a similar height of the extension at No.23 with the apex of the neighbouring extension roof being slightly taller. The extension will be set away 100mm from the neighbouring extension and project slightly beyond the rear wall of the extension at No.23. The proposed rear extension is a subservient addition, of a simple design with complimentary use of materials. The proposal is not visible as part of the street scene, it is considered acceptable in terms of design and impact on neighbouring amenity and is in keeping with the pattern of development in the area, particular the rear terraces of Eastern Road.

Rear dormer

5.7 The proposal is to introduce a dormer extension within the rear roof slope, set below the main roof ridge line and 500mm back from the existing eaves, extending from the existing loft. Officers note that original plans showed a bulkier, more intrusive dormer design. Revised plans have been submitted with the scheme showing a reduction in the height of the dormer by 85mm which officers view as acceptable. It is noted that large rear dormers are present on several other properties within the terrace, including a mixture of styles and details. The flat roof design of the dormer is acceptable, as it would reflect the form of other roof enlargements in the area. A black aluminium framed projecting oriel window is proposed from the rear elevation. Details of the materials proposed for the dormer walls are to be vertical profiled dark zinc cladding which has been used for other nearby dormers and is considered appropriate in relation to the surrounding context.

Front boundary treatment

5.8 The scheme proposes modifications to the front boundary which seeks to replace the metal railings with metal gates and remove the lower portions of the front boundary wall. The pylons appear damaged, and the scheme proposes to rebuild them which will greatly improve its appearance in this respect. Hardstanding is proposed within the front garden. No major landscaping alterations are proposed. These alterations are considered minor and will further improve the appearance and character of the CA.

Fenestration

5.9 All existing single glazed sash timber windows are proposed to be replaced with double glazed timber frames to match the existing appearance of the host property. These modifications are considered acceptable and will not harm the appearance and character of the CA and will be proportionate to the design of the host property.

Rooflights

5.10 The scheme proposes 4no. new rooflights, 2no. of which will be within the proposed rear extension and dormer and 2no. within the side and front roof slope. These would be suitably proportioned, so to not overly dominate the front elevation of the building. There are other properties in the locality, which incorporate front and side rooflights. Therefore, these new features would not be out of keeping and would be subordinate to the host property and surrounding area. It will be conditioned that the front and side roof lights are conservation style and sit flush with the main roof slope. Subject to this, officers do not have concerns regarding the proposed installation of rooflights.

Design Conclusion

5.11 Overall, the full scope of works proposed would be of acceptable design. There would not be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the surrounding area, the street scene or the CA. The special interest and historic significance of the CA would be preserved.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

5.12 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.

5.13 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.

5.14 Although the proposed dormer will be slightly larger than the existing, the proposed extensions and additions would not cause any material loss of sunlight or daylight or have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the neighbouring properties. The rear extension does not propose any excessive bulk and scale. Vegetation on the boundary between No.23 and the host property will provide adequate screening from the proposed extension and the neighbouring amenity of No.23 will not be lost. The new rear facing dormer window would allow views over the garden areas of nearby properties, but such overlooking is to be expected in dense urban areas. Therefore, this is acceptable on this basis. The proposed rooflights would not allow inappropriate overlooking of any neighbours. The amenity and living conditions of neighbouring properties would be suitably protected. Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and would not harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Transportation

5.15 Development Management DPD Policy DM33 states that the Council will only support a proposal for a crossover or new vehicular access where it is demonstrated that the proposal does not result in:

- a) a reduction in pedestrian or highway safety;
- b) a reduction of on-street parking capacity within a Controlled Parking Zone;
- c) or a visual intrusion to the street scene.

5.16 Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan seeks to promote road safety and pedestrian movement.

5.17 Policy DM34 states that the Council will only permit parking on front gardens where a minimum of 50% of the existing soft landscaping area is being retained. Cumulative loss of front gardens can also impact the character and appearance of the neighbourhood resulting in harm to established streetscapes and the uniform appearances of groups of houses.

5.18 In making a decision on this application the LPA need to be mindful of relevant planning legislation and in particular the scope of 'permitted development' rights. In this case the use of land for the parking of a car does not require permission as it is "permitted development" under Class F, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

5.19 While in most cases the formation, laying out and construction of a means of access to a highway does not require permission, consent is required here as the road is a classified road (as per Class F, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015).

5.20 LBH Transportation have objected to the proposed crossover as it would result in the loss of an on-street parking space. Although the proposed scheme would create an off-street parking space in its place, the proposed crossover will be subject to consultation to amend the TMO. This is further described in the informatives section of this report. If any objections cannot be resolved,

nor can the granting of planning consent here be taken as to convey certainty that amending the TMO is supported.

Conclusion

5.21 The proposed development is considered acceptable. There would not be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host building, the surrounding area, the street scene or the Conservation Area. The special interest and historic significance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. The amenity, privacy and living conditions of neighbouring properties would be protected.

5.22 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.

6. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A

7. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING 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.

- 3 The proposed rooflight(s) hereby approved shall be 'Conservation style', flush with the roof plane in which they are installed, and shall be maintained as such for the lifespan of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for

- 4 Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a schedule of all the proposed external finishes and materials, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include a schedule of the exact product references or other satisfactory details for: brickwork, tiling, cladding, stonework, render finishes, railings and brick walls. Thereafter, the works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved materials and details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development and to ensure the character of the Stroud Green Conservation Area is preserved, consistent with Policies SP11 & SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies

DM1, DM9 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD (2017).

- 5 Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, detail drawings of proposed windows at a scale of 1:10 or 1:5 including lintels and reveals and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development and to ensure the character of the Stroud Green Conservation Area is preserved, consistent with Policies SP11 & SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD (2017).

Informatives:

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: 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: 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.

INFORMATIVE: Crossovers

The proposed development would require a new crossover to be created. The necessary works would be carried out by the Council at the applicant's expense once all the necessary internal site works have been completed. The applicant should telephone 020 8489 1316 to obtain a cost estimate and to arrange for the works to be carried out. Equally installing a vehicle crossover here would trigger the need to amend an existing Traffic Management Order (TMO), with the full cost of amending both the TMO and changing road markings being needed to be met by the applicants. The applicants must be aware that there could be objections to amending the TMO due to the loss of on-street car parking and the objections may not be resolved, nor can the granting of planning consent here be taken as to convey certainty that amending the TMO is supported.