



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1214
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	36 Vallance Road, Hornsey, London, N22 7UB
Proposal:	Erection of a replacement two storey side extension
Case Officer:	Ben Coffie
Valid Date:	05/05/2023
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Jurik & Dal Poz Jurik
Agent:	Mr Francisco Serradilla

RECOMMENDATION - Approve with Conditions

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a replacement two-storey side extension to this property. The proposed side extension will have a flat roof with brick finish to match the existing brick elements of the host dwelling.

The proposed extension will measure an approximate height of 6m, a maximum width of 4.7m towards the rear due to its triangular form and a minimum width of 2.6m at its front. The proposed depth of the extension will measure 5.7m.

Site and Surroundings

The site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on the southern side of Vallance Road which is within the Vallance Road Conservation Area. The property is characterised by render finish and a front bay window feature. The site is unique in that it is situated on the bend of the road therefore creating a triangular gap between the site and its northern neighbouring dwelling, No 38.

The Vallance Road Conservation Area consists largely of residential properties with a small group of commercial properties and a library located around the junction of The Avenue and Alexandra Park Road. The houses are predominantly substantial, traditionally built, two-storey buildings and, whilst these are of a range of designs, there are common features such as bay windows, overhanging eaves and common materials which give the area a unified character. The buildings are all of a similar age and there are a number of extensive groups of buildings that were clearly of the same design when originally built.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

No relevant planning history.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of press & site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and consultation letters. A total of 3 individual objections have been received, as summarised below and commented on below in the assessment of this application.

Design & heritage

- Extension will be overbearing, dominant and out-of-scale, out of character in terms of appearance of the existing building;
- Because of the bend in the road and the angle of No 36, this view is not representative of how No 36 looks from the pavement;
- Harmful to the character and appearance of Vallance Road Conservation Area/ failing preserve to or enhance;
- Proposed two-storey extension will be visible from the street and its flat roof will look decidedly alien; a pitched roof would be far more in keeping with all the other houses in Vallance Road;
- Property is Edwardian and not mid-century Arts and Crafts;
- Form, shape, use of sharp angles not sensitive to Edwardian character;
- Dark grey crittall windows is not in keeping with the original Edwardian house;
- Windows proposed have no link to the original design of the house;
- Location of the large kitchen/dining window looks rather clumsy and would look far better if it were lined up with the oriel window aperture above by relocating the new window to the left;

Impact on amenity

- Overbearing and overshadowing presence in relation to amenity of No 38;
- Loss of light/ sunlight to garden and patio to No 38;

- Impact on view from garden to No 38;
- A follow up application for a loft extension could see a pitched roof added to the extension, further exaggerating amenity concerns; (Comment: Note the Local Planning Authority can only assess what is presented in this current application. Any application for a roof extension would require permission and would need to be assessed accordingly).

Other

- Unacceptably high density and over-development of the site.

3. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and impact on character and appearance of the conservation area; and
2. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Design and impact on character and appearance of the conservation area

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.

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.

As outlined above the site is unique in that due to the bend in the road, the siting and positioning with the adjoining property at No 38 to the east, there is a triangular space between these properties which widens towards the rear as the sites taper.

The proposed two-storey side extension would largely adopt the footprint of the existing side extension; however it would have a triangular section extending beyond the existing side extension. To the side of this triangular section is an alleyway providing maintaining access to the rear garden.

The proposed side extension would comprise a flat roof and pale brick to match/complement the original brickwork to the rear elevation at ground floor level.

While it is noted that concerns are raised about the design of such an extension and it is accepted the extension will have a somewhat contemporary appearance, in the use of Crittal style windows, it is however pointed out that a contemporary addition can complement a period property, this is an acceptable approach to extending a house, even in a conservation area. Such an extension does however seek to respond to its immediate surroundings in the use of a pale brick.

Impact on front elevation/ street-scene

The proposed two-storey side extension would have a flat roof and would sit approximately 4.5m back from the front wall of the dwelling. Due to such a setback as well as the narrow nature of the gap in relation to fronts of Nos 36 & 38, such an extension would not be readily visible, with very limited views from the public realm. The original form and appearance to No 36 and 38, with their different roof forms would still be appreciated.

It is accepted that the introduction of such an extension within this space, reduces a small open gap between these properties, which provides some visibility of greenery in the background. It is however noted that such gaps are not a consistent feature to the pattern of development in the immediate area. Rather the pattern of development is of very narrow gaps between properties, in the form of closely spaced detached and semi-detached properties and linked terraces. As such in relation to the street-scene this extension is not at odds with the pattern of development to this area or visually harmful.

Rear & side elevation

In relation to the rear elevation the extension is relatively wide and is technically more than half the width of the dwelling, however it would still appear as a subordinate addition because of its height and scale being lower in height in relation to the original building form and the use of a step/ recess in relation to the rear building line.

Importantly the extension does not project beyond the rear elevation and therefore allows original feature such as the triple ground and first floor timber doors to be still appreciated, as well as the projecting first-floor bay window, features important to the character and appearance of this property. Equally the retention of a large rear garden to the rear of this property and building on part of the site with an existing extension/ existing hard surfacing mean the extent of development on this site is sensitive to the site and in no ways can be argued to amount to overdevelopment.

While concerns are raised about the shape and angular form of such an extension, this is not a reason to refuse consent. Such an extension seeks to use underutilised space and maintains a gap between the side of the extension and the flank elevation of No 38. As per photos provided in the representations received there is relatively high vegetation on the boundary separating No 36 and 38, as such meaning that views of such an extension when built as viewed from within the rear garden of No 38 at different vantage points will be in part obstructed.

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

In relation to the extension as discussed above the individual parts are considered acceptable and compatible in relation to this site, the pattern of development and the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area.

In the case here, the significance of the conservation area as a heritage asset lies more in the consistency and uniformity of these closely spaced detached, semi-detached properties and linked terraces. As such the fronts to these properties contribute more to the significance of the conservation area as a heritage asset, while the rears have a more neutral effect.

As discussed above in terms of the front and rear elevations, the extension here is considered acceptable in design and spatial terms, being subservient to the original house and having minimal impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, as such leaving it preserved.

In reaching this decision considerable importance and weight has been given to preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area, in line with the statutory test.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

London Plan 2021 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.

Development Management DPD 2017 Policy DM1 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.

As summarised above the proposal has given rise to a number of representations, raising concerns in relation to impact on the amenity to No 38.

It is accepted that the introduction of an extension here will lead to an element of change in relation to No 38, however such impacts would not be harmful.

The flat-roofed two-storey extension would be visible from certain vantage points within the garden of No 38, however such an extension would not be dominant or overbearing. Specifically, the placing of such an extension in the shadow of the current side elevation to this property and use of a flat roofed/ subordinate form and having a separating gap of 1.2m between the side of the extension and the boundary with No 38, ensures there will be no unacceptable impact on the residential amenity, in terms of conditions of daylight/ sunlight and overshadowing or overbearing impacts.

Daylight/ Sunlight and overshadowing

Noting the extension will not project beyond the rear elevation and that there are no windows on the side of No 38, the extension will not affect daylight to windows to this neighbouring property.

In terms of sunlight the extension will be located due south-west in terms of No 38. As per photos provided in the representations received it is noted that the rear elevation of No 38 at certain times of the day casts a shadow over part of its rear garden. As per the photos provided it is noted that the gaps between the properties serve to allow sunlight through, specifically at certain times of the day to hit the ground of the rear garden to No 38. This however is viewed to be afforded by the gap in the roof forms to these properties as opposed to being lower down. In terms

of the daily trajectory of the sun such an extension is too low in height to materially block sunlight.

Equally the placing of such an extension here would not breach BRE guideline for assessing impact, which sets out a test recommending that at least half of a garden or open space receive at least two hours sunlight on March 21. No 38 it is noted benefits from a generous sized rear garden.

As noted above the placing of such an extension in the shadow of the current side elevation to this property, the use of a 1.2m set back from the boundary and the step in the rear building line of the extension relative to the rear patio area of No 38, mean that such an extension would not materially increase overshadowing; the test being an increase of overshadowing of more than 20% to this rear garden amounting to an infringement of the BRE guidance.

As such, the proposed extension would not have any adverse impact against the amenity currently enjoyed by occupiers of the neighbouring properties and therefore is considered to be compliant with policy D6 of the London Plan and policy DM1 of the DPD.

Conditions:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| 2 | <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> |
| 3 | <p>The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.</p> |

	Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.
4	The south-east facing windows serving the first floor ensuite bathroom shall be obscured glazed to level 3 or higher on the Pilkington scale of privacy or equivalent. This specification shall be complied with before the extension is occupied and thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Reason: To safeguard against overlooking and loss of privacy in the interests of a amenity of neighbouring occupiers and to comply with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.
Informatives:	
	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: 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.