



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1565
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	93 Fairview Road, Tottenham, London, N15 6TT
Proposal:	Erection of a ground floor rear extension
Case Officer:	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date:	13/06/2023
	3
Applicant:	Mr Lipot Weiss
Agent:	Shulem Posen

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

- The proposed infill extension would by virtue of scale, depth, and massing would be unacceptably harmful in terms of increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No. 91 Fairview Road, 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).

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

2.1 This is an application for a wrap around rear extension, 9m in maximum depth, where 6m would have an eaves height of 3m, and the remaining 3m would have an eaves height of 2.3m.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is a two-storey residential dwellinghouse, in the area covered by the South Tottenham SPD. The area is a mix of architectural styles with some properties having square bay windows across both floors and others with bay windows at ground floor level. The gardens of this sites on the western side of Fairview Road have small and narrow gardens.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

2.3.1 HGY/2023/0069 | Prior Approval: Erection of a single storey rear extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3m and the eaves would be 3m

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

Internal:

- No responses

External:

- No responses

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way 13 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: 2

Objecting: 2

The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Overbearing
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy

The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- None raised

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Design and appearance; and
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and appearance

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 Permission is sought for a large wrap around rear extension, finished in materials to match the existing dwellinghouse, with the installation of a sukkah roof at the rear and bi-fold doors onto the rear garden. The side infill portion would be 9m in depth, with an eaves height of 3m, apart from the final 3m which would be chamfered down to 2.3m. The rear portion of the extension would protrude 3m from the rear of the original dwellinghouse, with an eaves/maximum height of 3m.

5.4 Officers note that the site has a narrow gap between the outrigger and boundary with No. 91 Fairview Road, and the garden is quite small. The proposed extension would see more than 50% of the original rear garden covered by buildings.

5.5 Additionally, Officers note that the dimensions of the side and rear extensions are in line with the GPDO, and the addition of the chamfered section with a lower eaves (creating a wrap-around extension) requires full planning permission, and this has been applied for in an effort to mitigate the need to build out the permitted development portion of the proposal at a different stage.

5.6 DPD Policy DM1 requires that proposals relate positively to their locality, and have a respect for the form, scale, and massing around the site, as well as maintaining a sense of enclosure and the rhythm of neighbouring plot/building widths.

5.7 Officers note that the full scale of the proposal in its current form covers a significant portion of the rear garden, and this scale struggles to appear subordinate to the host dwellinghouse, and neglects to respect the existing form/massing around the site.

5.8 The neighbouring property, No. 95 Fairview Road, has a side infill and rear extension in place, granted via Part 1 Class A(ea) Prior Approval ref: HGY/2021/1507. The approval mentioned at No. 95 Fairview Road, is similar to that granted at the application site, under permission ref: HGY/2023/0069 (6m deep prior approval for a side extension, along the side of the outrigger) and it is acknowledged that this application ref: HGY/2023/0069 would be a fall-back position for the proposed if it were to be refused. That being stated, the LPA deem that the fall-back position in this instance is the most compliant option with Policy DM1, as the addition of the chamfered infill leads to an overdevelopment of the site that is not sensitive to the form, scale or massing around the site, and creates a sense of enclosure with neighbouring properties.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

5.9 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.

5.10 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.

5.11 With respect to impact on neighbouring amenity, Officers would like to highlight the specificity of the situation created by the proposal. The small gardens, narrow space between the outriggers, and presence of a three-storey wall created by 59 Gladesmore Road at the end of the garden lead to a heightened sensitivity to the potential impact on amenity caused by the scale of the proposed development.

5.12 Notably, objections have been received from Nos. 91 and 89 Fairview Road, and the creation of a sense of enclosure of No 91 is of specific interest.

5.13 Officers deem that, the presence of a three-storey rear wall to the west (created by No. 59 Gladesmore Ave), garage on the southwestern boundary of the garden, and now, potentially the creation of a 9m wall along the northern boundary of No 91 Fairview Road proposed by this application, would lead to a sense of enclosure at a level that would be unacceptable and in breach of London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policy DM1, despite measures taken to lower the final 3m of the proposed extension to a height of 2.3m.

5.14 The LPA would usually consider a proposal where the entire eaves height proposed along the boundary were lowered to 2.3m, and the LPA acknowledge that there is permission in place that would see a 6m deep extension with an eaves of 3m along the boundary with No. 91 Fairview Road. The LPA deem in this instance however, that the factors stated in point 5.13 are sufficient to suggest that the additional depth, even at a lower eaves height would be enough to create a sense of enclosure contrary to policy, and the application should be refused on amenity grounds.

5.15 Officers suggest that the extensions allowed under permitted development afforded by application ref: HGY/2023/0067 would be the best option at this stage to mitigate any further impact on the amenity of 91 Fairview Road.

Conclusion

5.16 The proposal is considered not acceptable as the proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, that would create a sense of enclosure for the residents of No. 91 Fairview Road.

5.17 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted/refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

7. 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.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

For the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed infill extension would by virtue of scale, depth, and massing would be unacceptably harmful in terms of increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No. 91 Fairview Road, 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).