

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1531
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	Flat A, 233 Alexandra Park Road, Wood Green, London, N22 7BJ
Proposal:	Rear and infill extension along with increasing the floor to ceiling height within the existing lower ground floor and an elevated rear deck area and other associated external changes.
Case Officer:	Zara Seelig
Valid Date:	12/06/2023
Applicant:	Lauren Chapple
Agent:	Mr Max Howard

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

The planning application is for a rear and side infill extension, including increasing the internal floor to ceiling height in connection within the existing lower ground floor, alongside other associated external changes.

Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a two-storey mid-terraced building consisting of two self-contained flats situated on the Northern side of Alexandra Park Road. The site consists of a lower ground/ basement floor, common to properties on this side of the road. The site is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

OLD/1983/0013 – Conversion into 2 self-contained flats –Approved (with conditions)

HGY/2017/1091 – (Flat B) Roof extension involving a rear dormer and front elevation rooflights to facilitate a loft conversion – Approved (with conditions)

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 9 neighbour consultation letters. No representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

4. 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 for a rear extension to the back of the current outrigger to this property, projecting marginally deeper than an outrigger extension to the back of No 235. The proposal is also for an infill side extension on the boundary with No 231, as such creating a wrap around extension to the back of this property. Also, to the rear of the extension will be a small deck area.

Along the side with No 231 a small courtyard space will be created between the inner rear building line and the start of the wrap around extension. This would provide natural light to both the bathroom and the new bedroom / office. The extension would be faced in

masonry brickwork (London stock yellow) to match existing and have Crittal style, aluminium doors on the rear elevation.

In the context of the rear elevation and this extension being at lower ground level, it is viewed to be a subordinate addition. The extension would not harm the character and appearance of this area, where there are different building types and different rear extensions.

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.

While it is accepted the extension in design terms is subordinate in scale to the existing property, the siting and scale of the extension here presents specific issues for amenity, in specific in relation to No 231.

The proposal would be built right up to the boundary with No 231 with a depth of 4.15 metres and height of 4.1 metres on this boundary. Given the height and depth of such an extension as well as the differences in levels between No 231 and the application site, such an extension would appear overbearing and create a sense of enclosure for the occupants of this property.

The proposal would not impact the neighbouring amenity of attached neighbouring property of No. 235 due to the proposal extending a minimal amount further than the ground floor extension to the back of the outrigger.

The creation of a small deck area is not viewed to be harmful to neighbouring amenity. As shown in the plans submitted, planter screens would be positioned on both sides of the elevated terrace to minimise overlooking.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered unacceptable due to its adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, in specific No 231, 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.

5. 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.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development by reason of its depth, height and siting on the boundary line with No 231, coupled with the difference in levels between these properties, would be unacceptably harmful in terms of outlook and lead to an increased sense of enclosure and overbearing impact, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).