



native north

43 Leaside Avenue, London, N10 3BT

Design and Access Statement

A3

27 July 2023

Contents

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Location and Existing Situation

3.0 Existing Images

4.0 Pre Application Advice

5.0 Design

6.0 Appearance

7.0 Landscaping

8.0 Access

9.0 Planning policy

10.0 Conclusion



Location Plan
1 : 1250

1. OS Map of site

1.0 Introduction

The existing site contains a two storey, cellar plus roof terraced building which is in use as C3 residential.

The following statement provides commentary in support of carefully considered enhancement to the existing building. This includes –

- 1.1 Replacement single storey rear extension with roof glazing
- 1.2 Two storey side infill front extension
- 1.3 Loft floor side extension
- 1.4 New and replacement low profile conservation style rooflights
- 1.5 Re-covering of the existing rear facing dormer
- 1.6 Pebble dash removal

This statement provides background information relating to the site and describes the proposed development. The property is located in the Muswell Hill Conservation Area, Sub Area 4, designated in 01 March 1974, but is not listed nor subject to Article 4 directions. There is no Neighbourhood Plan for the area.

The property is located within Flood Zone 1 (low probability), and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2 which represents a lower level of public transport accessibility. The site is not subject to TPO's.

This document should be read in conjunction with the architectural drawings.

2.0 Location and Existing Situation

The application site is situated within the London Borough of Haringey, to the West of the borough. The site is located approximately 0.8 miles from East Finchley underground station and 1 mile from Highgate underground station.

The application site contains an existing semi-detached two storey building where the properties on the West side of Leaside Avenue sit in 'pairs'. Whilst there is some consistency in red brickwork and white timber framed windows, there is a more eccentric mix of rendered upper floors, front gables, front dormers and both square and canted front bays. Roof finishes also vary from rosemary red clay plain tiles to slate and areas of flat leaded or felted roofs. The rear of the properties also feature variety where a collection of larger ground floor rear extensions and roof dormers have been added.

The surrounding area is characterised by residential properties of a similar character built from the mid 1900's onwards. Private houses are typically two storey with some infill on Leaside Avenue and surrounding streets as a result of assumed bomb damage.

Existing images are overleaf.



2. Muswell Hill Conservation Area map highlighting the site within the boundary.

The property has planning history available online with the only relevant application being:


HGY/1991/1122 – Erection of rear dormer window to facilitate loft conversion.
Application Permitted 11 November 1991



1. Front elevation at 43 Leaside Avenue (right of centre)



2. View between properties at 45 and 43 Leaside Ave



3. Enhanced view of neighbouring windows at No.45



4. Existing rear elevation viewed from garden



5. Similar roof infill on Leaside Avenue



6. View from rear garden to Collingwood Avenue

4.0 Pre Application Advice

Prior to this submission the applicant sought pre-application advice from LB Haringey in April 2023 (Council ref. PRE/2023/0069). Formal advice was provided in writing on the 10th July 2023 and a copy of the letter is provided at Appendix 1.

For ease of reference we have set out below a written response to the key comments contained within the letter, summarising what design changes have been made to address each point.

Two storey front/side extension

'Paragraph 16.16 of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal recommends that "Where the loss or alteration of original architectural features has occurred there has been a diminution in the character and quality of the frontages of houses within the conservation area. However, it is felt that these changes have not been on a sufficient scale to significantly undermine the integrity of the street scene in the Muswell Hill Conservation Area."

The recessed side projections linking the houses in this stretch of the street are considered a distinctive characteristic of the street and conservation area, as are the gaps between the front parts of the houses. Even the partial infilling of this gap would be considered harmful to the character of the conservation area.'

RESPONSE: We are in agreement that the recesses are an important feature of Leaside Avenue to maintain a sense of separation, and giving the appearance of semi detached properties despite being terraced. Since pre application, and to maintain this appearance, the applicant has further recessed the proposed side extension to 1.7m back from the front of the property. This would result in a considerable set back allowing properties at No.43 and 45 Leaside Avenue to read with separation from the streetscene. The materials and window openings brought forward would match that of the existing front elevation making for no change. A flat roof design has been adopted to enhance the sense of subordination and differentiation from the main house.

The Muswell Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal (pg38, section 7.16) makes no specific reference to recesses between houses on Leaside Avenue.

'Although this would detract from the appearance and characteristic of the building and wider conservation area, the proposed windows would not cause overlooking to neighbouring properties, and the scale of the development would not be overbearing. The neighbouring windows in the side return at no.45 do not serve habitable rooms, and therefore there would not be impact on neighbouring amenity.'

RESPONSE: Changes as described above given amenity is considered acceptable.

Replacement single-storey rear extension with roof windows

'The proposed replacement would be wider by 1m than the existing rear extension but would be a similar design with the same side sloping mono-pitched roof. The proposed material would provide a modernised appearance but given its form and modest scale the replacement extension would retain its subordinate appearance to the main house and is considered acceptable.'

RESPONSE: No changes as proposal is considered acceptable.

Rear Dormer

'It is proposed that the rear dormer be re-covered in red standing zinc cladding. These changes would update the appearance of the existing rear dormer which is in a state of disrepair. The proposed materials are considered to preserve and enhance the appearance of the conservation area and is considered acceptable. However, the drawings do show that the main roof would be raised, and officers would question whether this is necessary or appropriate.'

RESPONSE: No changes as proposal is considered acceptable. Justin Brown clarified with case officer Daniel Kwasi Boama that no changes were proposed to the ridge height. This was misinterpretation of the drawings.

Loft side extension

'There are examples of this type of development along this side of the Leaside Avenue. The proposed side roof extension would be at the second floor towards the rear. It would be finished in red standing seam zinc cladding to match the proposed replacement rear dormer material. It would also have a roof light above on a flat roof. This extension would not extend above the ridge of the main roof, beyond side boundary, and beyond the rear wall. Officers are satisfied that it appears suitably subordinate and proportionate to the main house and so is considered acceptable.'

RESPONSE: No changes as proposal is considered acceptable.

Rear balcony on 2nd floor level

'This would comprise a 1.1m high frameless glass balustrade, and a 1.7m high frosted screen on the side facing no.45. As mentioned in the submitted Design and Access Statement, this is proposed given its visually light appearance with high levels of transparency. It would be accessed from the second-floor study room. From a purely character and appearance point of view, the proposed balcony is considered acceptable.'

RESPONSE: The rear balcony has been omitted from the application.

Driveway

'The proposed alterations to the driveway would not be supported. The parking space and parked vehicle would take up too significant a proportion of the front garden, giving it a cramped and incongruous appearance, out of character with the rest of the street.'

RESPONSE: Alterations to the driveway have been omitted from the application.

5.0 Design

Use

The replacement rear extension is in poor condition and improvements are largely forced by the aging building fabric. This will see the kitchen exchanged with dining to primarily help address the aforementioned issues with better aspect out and physical connection to the rear garden.

The two storey side infill extension looks to provide a cloakroom WC accessed from the entrance hallway. At first floor, this provides additional space for the master bedroom ensuite. Two modest windows are provided to be in keeping with the existing frontage and one simple rooflight over the first floor shower.

The side extension at roof level looks to replace eaves storage by providing a compact showeroom with facility for the two loft level bedrooms.

The new or replacement rooflights to the front elevation proposed as low profile conservation style. These are proposed to enhance the levels of natural daylight and ventilation to the front facing loft bedroom.

Layout

There are little to no changes proposed to the layout of the house. The social spaces will remain on the ground floor. The more private bedroom spaces are split over the first floor and loft level as existing.

This information has been provided through drawings that accompany the planning application.

Amount

The replacement rear extension is to match the depth of existing, and is proposed 1m wider than the existing to maintain balance with the proportions of the rear facing bay window. The height remains largely unchanged with only the eaves of the slope raised approximately 450mm to provide better internal head height.

The side infill extension is approximately 1.36m wide x 3.22m deep providing a setback of approximately 1.7m from the porch frontage. This rises to sit some 375mm below that of the main house eaves which combined with the porch setback, address matters of subordination. It should be noted that the adjacent window openings at No.45 Leaside Avenue are generally frosted and to non-habitable spaces.



1. Birds Eye view looking West, site highlighted in red



2. Birds Eye view looking East, site highlighted in red

5.0 Design continued.

Amount continued.

The loft side extension is to be altered to match most of the properties on Leaside Avenue. This would see the existing ridge height maintained, but infill to the party wall line.

Local precedent applications;

HGY/2022/0196 - Erection of a rear dormer including the insertion of 2x front conservation rooflights. Widening of rear glazed doors and side windows on rear ground floor extension. Approved 17/3/22


HGY/2020/2349 - To replace and enlarge the existing single-storey rear outrigger, replace existing dormer windows, reinstate a decorative panel to the front dormer windows, reinstate stained glazing into the original front door and frames, replace the existing single glazed windows with heritage style timber windows, one front and 2 rear rooflights. Approved 30/10/20

HGY/2019/1662 - Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of (larger) single storey rear extension in its place. Approved 30/7/2019

HGY/2018/1272 - Demolition of existing single storey rear extension. Erection of single storey rear extension. Erection of rear dormer window. Insertion of 3 rooflights in front roof slope. Approved 07/6/2018

HGY/2017/2388 - Erection of rear roof dormer extension following demolition of existing rear roof dormer extension, alterations to existing front roof windows and the installation of 2no. new roof windows. Approved 12/9/2017

HGY/2016/4178 - Replacement of the existing rear extension and erection of a rear dormer and insertion of x1 conservation style rooflight to the front elevation. Approved 28/2/2017



1. Concept design perspective of design development - **INDICATIVE ONLY**

6.0 Appearance

Rear extension

The rear extension is proposed in brickwork to match existing. The glazed openings are to be double glazed, thermally broken aluminium in a crittall style. The roof is to be finished in a red standing seam zinc to match other elements of the proposal for uniformity.

Side infill extension

The side infill extension is again proposed in brickwork to match existing. The 2no. front facing window additions are proposed double glazed in white timber framing with fenestration of similar appearance to the existing windows.

Loft side extension

The party wall is to be built up in brickwork to match existing between No. 45 and 43 Leaside Avenue. The front and rear elevations are proposed to be in filled with red standing seam zinc cladding to bring consistency and harmony between the red brick and roofing tiles of the existing property.

Rear dormer

The rear dormer is currently clad in an unknown roofing tile, assumed as a faded man made 'slate'. To bring consistency and uniformity between elements, this is proposed to be re-covered in red standing seam zinc cladding.

The proposed extensions and alterations have been designed to minimise impact on adjacent properties. The proposed extensions and new glazing would not result in loss of privacy of neighbours.

First floor pebble dash

The existing pebble dash finish to the first floor level is in a white appearance. The applicant proposes to remove the pebble dash which is failing in various areas and revert to brickwork where the brick facing would be made good and the front elevation repointed using a lime mortar mixture.

Various properties on Leaside Avenue feature brickwork over ground and first floors. This has also been queried and deemed acceptable via email exchange with the pre application case officer.

7.0 Landscaping

The existing front garden is modest at approximately 4m deep and 8.5m wide with an existing parking space and some planting. No changes are proposed within this application. The rear garden is more extensive, again with no changes proposed within this application.

8.0 Access


Access will remain unchanged.



1. Precedent - Properties directly opposite at 44 & 46 Leaside Avenue with brickwork to ground and first floors



1. Lambs 'red rubber' brickwork to match existing



2. Pigmento red zinc on red brick combination

9.0 Planning policy

The proposal has been developed with due consideration for;

- London Plan Policy D6, HC1
- DPD Policy DM1, DM9, DM12
- SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017.
- The design, appearance and impact on the Muswell Hill conservation area.

High standard of design - As Architects, we hold ourselves to the highest standards of design. The proposals are the result of carefully considered design development, refinement and collaboration with the applicant.

Neighbouring amenity - The proposals give due consideration to the amenity of neighbouring properties. The front side extension has been developed with consideration that the neighbouring property at No. 45 only has windows which serve non-habitable spaces to the side passage. The proposals are deemed compliant with the Building Research Establishments (BRE); 'site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice (BR209)'. The newly proposed front facing windows would make no difference to the existing situation.

Sustainable design - The existing building is ageing and in need of refurbishment. The proposals will adopt a 'fabric first' approach with high levels of insulation, air tightness and with higher performing windows where replaced. These measures will continue to protect the life span and longevity of the building and look to address energy costs for the applicant.

Height, form, scale and massing - The proposals are carefully considered to either replicate the form/scale of existing features as demonstrated with the replacement rear extension. Where new elements are introduced such as the front side extension, this is proposed below the height of the existing building eaves and set back from the front elevation to ensure it is subordinate in design. The loft side extension replicates a feature present in most other properties along Leaside Avenue and is therefore deemed acceptable as noted in pre application discussions.

Distinctive local style - The chosen material palette largely replicates that of the existing. Where more contemporary materials are proposed such as the pigmento red zinc, this more contemporary approach is focussed to the rear elevation where it is considered more acceptable with no contribution to the street scene or Conservation Area.

The proposed development also accords with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

native **north**

10.0 Conclusion

This planning application proposes alterations to the existing building which are sensitive enhancements of existing building. Similar alterations feature, or have been previously permitted in the local area. Proposals are also motivated to improve quality of life for the applicant, and maintain the fabric of an ageing building.

The principle of the proposed extensions and alterations are considered to be acceptable. This is supported in pre application discussions. The site has history of permissions for similar development in principle and there are other examples of extensions on Leaside Avenue, Collingwood Avenue and the surrounding streets of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

The proposed extensions are considered to be well designed, of an appropriate scale and in line with what would be considered acceptable. All extensions are subservient to the existing building and will be constructed in materials which match or are complimentary to the existing building. The proposed alterations continue to protect the heritage significance of the surrounding Conservation Area whilst acknowledging the need for development.

The proposed dwelling is considered to be acceptable in terms of size, design and amenity.

The proposal results in no amenity impacts to neighbouring occupiers. The amenity of the applicant is considered to be greatly improved by the proposal allowing the family to grow and remain in the property and surrounding area.

If you have any queries or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at the below address.

Contact:

In the first instance any queries or site visit requests should be directed to:

native north architects.

Mr Justin Brown

BArch (Hons) DipArch (ARB)

t. 020 3488 1312

e. justin@nativenorth.co

As paragraph 38 of the NPPF, we expect to approach decision-taking in a positive and creative way to deliver this sustainable development. If required, we expect to look for solutions in a proactive manner with the applicant seeking to approve this application for sustainable development.

43 Leaside Avenue, London, N10 3BT

Design and Access Statement

A3

27 July 2023



Pre-Application Planning Advice Note

Ref: PRE/2023/0069

Date of meeting: 13/04/2023

Thank you for attending the recent Pre-Application Planning advice meeting with Haringey Council to discuss your proposal. We hope you found the meeting useful. The points discussed at the meeting are outlined below, along with feedback from the Planning Service about aspects that were good, could be improved, or are unlikely to obtain planning permission as currently proposed. We hope this summary will provide you with useful guidance about the steps you will need to take before submitting an application for planning permission.

If you have any questions about the feedback we have provided, please contact the named officer who will be able to clarify the advice. If you require further advice, our website can provide you with some information about the things we take into consideration when determining a planning application, or you can book a second pre-application advice meeting.

Site Address: 43 Leaside Avenue, Hornsey, London, N10 3BT

Proposal: Replacement single storey rear extension with roof glazing. Two storey side infill extension and loft side extension. New and replacement low profile, conservation style roof lights. Rear facing balcony and recovering of the existing rear facing dormer. Alterations to the front porch. and reconfiguration of the existing front driveway (existing dropped kerb).

Meeting Date: 13/04/2023

Attendees: Justin Brown and Daniel Kwasi Boama

Summary of Council's response

Overall RAG Rating	Reason for rating
	Overall, the proposed enlarged replacement rear extension, recladding of the existing rear dormer and new extension to the side of the roof are considered to be acceptable in regard to design and impact on the conservation area. The proposed extensions and alterations at the rear would appear suitably be proportionate and subordinate the main dwelling. However, the drawings do show that the main roof would be raised, and officers would question whether this is necessary or appropriate. Subject to not raising the height of the main roof, these elements of the proposed development are considered acceptable in scale and in terms of their impact on neighbouring amenity. The two-storey side extension would detract from the character and appearance of the building and street as well as being detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and therefore is unacceptable. The proposed rear balcony at the second-floor level while appropriately designed, would be considered unacceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring amenity. The proposed alterations to the driveway would not be supported. The parking space and parked vehicle would take up too significant a proportion of the front garden, giving it a cramped and incongruous appearance, out of character with the rest of the street.

Review of submitted proposal

The assessment of the proposal submitted uses a RAG rating system (see below). Comments are provided on the reasons for the rating given.

Red = This element of the element is not currently considered to be acceptable.

Amber = This element of the proposal has not been adequately addressed within the submission.

Green = This element of the proposal is considered to be acceptable by officers.

NOTE: The rating assigned is a result of the officer's consideration of the proposal against the current planning policy (see below) and all other material planning considerations insofar as they are known at this stage (i.e before consultation with the neighbours has taken place).

Policy aspect				Comments
Comments on Design and Impact on Conservation Area				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. 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. It is advised that Heritage Statement should be submitted with any future planning application. <u>Two storey front/side extension</u> Paragraph 16.16 of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal recommends that <i>"Where the loss or alteration of original architectural features has occurred there has been a diminution in the character and quality of the frontages of houses within the conservation area. However, it is felt that these changes have not been on a sufficient scale to significantly undermine the integrity of the street scene in the Muswell Hill Conservation Area."</i> The recessed side projections linking the houses in this stretch of the street are considered a distinctive characteristic of the street and conservation area, as are the gaps between the front parts of the houses. Even the partial infilling of this gap would be considered harmful to the character of the conservation area.

			<u>Replacement single-storey rear extension with roof windows</u> The proposed replacement would be wider by 1m than the existing rear extension but would be a similar design with the same side sloping mono-pitched roof. The proposed material would provide a modernised appearance but given its form and modest scale the replacement extension would retain its subordinate appearance to the main house and is considered acceptable. <u>Rear Dormer</u> It is proposed that the rear dormer be re-covered in red standing zinc cladding. These changes would update the appearance of the existing rear dormer which is in a state of disrepair. The proposed materials are considered to preserve and enhance the appearance of the conservation area and is considered acceptable. However, the drawings do show that the main roof would be raised, and officers would question whether this is necessary or appropriate. <u>Loft side extension</u> There are examples of this type of development along this side of the Leaside Avenue. The proposed side roof extension would be at the second floor towards the rear. It would be finished in red standing seam zinc cladding to match the proposed replacement rear dormer material. It would also have a roof light above on a flat roof. This extension would not extend above the ridge of the main roof, beyond side boundary, and beyond the rear wall. Officers are satisfied that it appears suitably subordinate and proportionate to the main house and so is considered acceptable. <u>Rear balcony on 2nd floor level</u> This would comprise a 1.1m high frameless glass balustrade, and a 1.7m high frosted screen on the side facing no.45. As mentioned in the submitted Design and Access Statement, this is proposed given its visually light appearance with high levels of transparency. It would be accessed from the second-floor study room. From a purely character and appearance point of view, the proposed balcony is considered acceptable.
--	--	--	---

			<u>Driveway</u> The proposed alterations to the driveway would not be supported. The parking space and parked vehicle would take up too significant a proportion of the front garden, giving it a cramped and incongruous appearance, out of character with the rest of the street.
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. <u>Two storey front/side extension</u> Although this would detract from the appearance and characteristic of the building and wider conservation area, the proposed windows would not cause overlooking to neighbouring properties, and the scale of the development would not be overbearing. The neighbouring windows in the side return at no.45 do not serve habitable rooms, and therefore there would not be impact on neighbouring amenity. <u>Replacement rear extension</u> This is would not cause neighbouring properties to lose their privacy, daylight and sunlight, and the design would not be at an overbearing scale, and therefore is considered acceptable. <u>Rear dormer</u>

			Apart from changes in external materials, no other changes are proposed and therefore it is considered that there would not be an impact on neighbouring amenity. <u>Loft side extension</u> This would not appear overbearing in scale and not lead to a loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, and therefore is considered acceptable. <u>Rear balcony on 2nd floor level</u> This would comprise a 1.1m high frameless glass balustrade, and a 1.7m high frosted screen on the side facing no.45. The frosted screen prevents overlooking into the neighbouring property and so their privacy would not be hindered. However, the design could potentially lead to overlooking into the neighbouring windows at no.41 leading to a loss of privacy and therefore is considered unacceptable. The roof terrace at no.39 belongs to a flat and was possibly built at time when the policy on private outdoor amenity space was different, or it was built without planning permission. It is also built at the first-floor level instead of the second-floor level, which reduces amount overlooking into neighbouring properties.
Highways			The Council's Highways Team have provided the following advice; was consulted but did not provide written advice: • Diagonal parking would not be supported. Only 90-degree access and egress would be supported. • It might be possible to move the vehicle access and driveway to the other side the street tree subject to the following requirements: - o A minimum 4.8m deep parking space is provided. Anything shorter would not be supported. - o The crossover is 1.2m away from the tree. - o To drop the curb on the other side of the street you would need to remove the existing dropped curb, because an on-street parking space is being replaced.to ensure on street parking capacity is maintained. - o Planning permission is required for a new of modified vehicle crossover

				because the property is in a conservation area. For more details please visit Vehicle crossover (dropped kerbs) Haringey Council
Issues regarding previous history of the property				HGY/1991/1122 - Erection of rear dormer window to facilitate loft conversion – Granted permission on 11/11/1991.

Next steps

If you decide to proceed with applying for Planning Permission, the following information will be required when you submit your application:

1. The completed householder application form or full application form if the property is a flat (available on our website or from the [Planning Portal](#))
2. Location plan at a scale of 1:1250 with a red line around the site in question.
3. Site plan at a scale of 1:500 or 1:200 showing the direction of North, the proposed development in relation to the site boundaries and written dimensions.
4. Existing and proposed plans (elevations, floor plans, roof plans and section where appropriate). All plans/elevations must have a scale bar and dimensions.
5. Fee.
6. Energy Statement (all new buildings) which must demonstrate compliance with Local Plan Policy SP4.

The planning application process

Once you have submitted your planning application, it goes through a number of steps:

1. **Validation/Checking**

Applications are checked to make sure all required documents and fees are there, and checked for any potential issues which need addressed to ensure compliance with policy, if considered 'valid' and likely to be acceptable they are registered, applications are only checked when an officer is available so there can be a number of weeks before an application is validated and checked.

2. **Registration**

The application is entered into the register of applications and customers are informed formally that their application is registered, their application reference number, their case officer and the deadline they can expect to hear back by.

3. **Consultation** (a minimum of 21 days following registration)

Details of the application will be provided to neighbours in line with our consultation policy and they will have the opportunity to comment on the proposed development. Consultees are given a minimum of 21 days to comment on an application.

4. **Decision** (Usually as soon as the consultation has ended).

The planning service can deal with most householder applications under delegated powers and will issue a decision notice to stating whether the application has been approved or refused, and if there are any conditions that must be met.

Carrying out building works

Once you have planning permission, it is recommended that you obtain technical advice regarding building control matters. Building Control services ensure that the works carried out by your appointed builders are done safely. Building Control services can be found through your local council or an Approved Inspector service.

Haringey Building Control has extensive experience in working with clients on a wide range of projects. Should you wish to discuss your project and how Haringey Building Control may best advise you regarding compliance with relevant building control regulations, please contact Building Control on 020 8489 5504 or by email on building.control@haringey.gov.uk

List of relevant contacts

Planning Officer: Daniel Kwasi
Phone: 07580 716850

INFORMATIVE

Please be advised that this response is given at officer level and does not form a formal response or decision of the Council with regard to future planning application(s) or other formal approaches. The views expressed above are given in good faith, to the best of ability, and without prejudice to the formal consideration of any future planning application, which will be subject to formal consultation and ultimately decided on by the Council.