



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1492
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	70 Stanhope Gardens, Tottenham, London, N4 1HT
Proposal:	First floor rear extension over existing ground floor kitchen
Case Officer:	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date:	07/06/2023
Applicant:	Mr Windsor Smith
Agent:	Mr Ed Musu

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

1.1 This is an application for first floor rear extension. Proposed first floor extension: depth 1.7m, width 3.4m and overall height at 4.3m, set in 1.7m from adjoining property at no.72 and adjoins the boundary with no.68 Stanhope Gardens. Provides extended bedroom at first floor level.

Site and Surroundings

1.2 The site application is mid terrace two-storey dwelling situated on the southern side of Stanhope Gardens, close to the junction with Doncaster Gardens. The property benefit from single storey rear extension. The surrounding area is predominately residential in character.

1.3 The site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

1.4 There is no planning or enforcement history in relation to the site.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of 6 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: 0

Objecting: 0

Supporting: 0

3. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the area;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;

Design and appearance

3.2 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.

3.3 The application site at No.70 is a two-storey, terraced, dwelling located on the southern side of Stanhope Gardens and the rear elevations containing the rear outrigger are constructed under simple, unaltered with pitched roofs. In addition, they share two-storey rear outriggers with pitched roofs which remain mostly unaltered. Such common features give these properties a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity. The rear of the properties has a set rhythm and conformity that establish the character of the terrace. This includes, not only the visual appearance of the existing dwellings, but also the visual and spatial relationship of the building to the amenity spaces to the rear.

3.4 The design and appearance of the first-floor extension is considered unacceptable and insensitive within the street scene and would not detract from the character of the immediate area. The poor design does not complement the existing form of the host property. The proposal would appear not subordinate to the host property and the overall form and design would not respect the dwelling/terrace. Although at the rear of the property, the development would be clearly visible from gardens area of the adjoining properties. From here, it will appear as a visually prominent bulky and incongruous addition to the building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

3.5 It is considered that the proposed extension would represent a discordant development in terms of its design and position and would offer no subordination to the host property and be an overbearing feature for the adjoining neighbours when viewed from the rear.

3.6 Proposed first floor rear addition would overwhelm the scale and massing of the existing house, with unacceptable impact on the appearance and character of this part Stanhope Gardens. As such, proposed first floor rear extension in this location would appear as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the rear of the host building, which would be prominent and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

3.7 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.

3.8 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.

3.9 Although, the proposed extension would not impinge on a line drawn at 45 degrees from the centre of attached neighbour's rear habitable window. The adjoining property at No.68 Stanhope Gardens has rear window within less than 1.0m of the common boundary with the extension. This adjoining window serves a bedroom. It is considered that as a result the proposed extension within mutual boundary with attached neighbour at no.68, the proposed extension would unacceptably dominate the outlook from the habitable room served by the window. Given its depth and height on the shared boundary, the extension would be overbearing, having a significant detrimental impact on the outlook from No.68 and resulting in an increased sense of enclosure. As such, it is considered that it would have an unacceptable impact on living conditions at that property.

r.

3.11 The proposed extension would be set in sufficiently from the boundary with no.72 Stanhope Gardens with minimal impact on its light and outlook. So would not have any significant harm to the amenities of this adjoining occupier.

Conclusion

3.12 The proposal is considered not acceptable and would result in an unsympathetic, incongruous and harmful addition which would have a serious and adverse effect on the visual amenity of the locality. As such, the proposal intrusive and unneighbourly addition, resulting in an overbearing and dominant development giving rise to an increase sense of enclosure and loss of outlook to the detriment of residential and visual amenities to the occupiers of the adjoining property, contrary to Policy DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document, and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021.

3.13 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.

4. 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.

5. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

Proposed first floor rear extension would result in an unsympathetic, incongruous and harmful addition which would have a serious and adverse effect on the visual amenity of the locality, and would appear an obtrusive, unneighbourly, overbearing and over dominant form of development that would give rise to an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook to the detriment of residential and visual amenities to the occupiers of the adjoining property. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document, and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021.