



# Officer Report

|                            |                                             |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | <b>HGY/2023/1798</b>                        |
| <b>Application Type:</b>   | <b>Householder planning permission</b>      |
| <b>Address:</b>            | 298 Philip Lane, Tottenham, London, N15 4AB |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Single storey rear extension                |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Sabelle Adjagboni                           |
| <b>Valid Date:</b>         | 07/07/2023                                  |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Anna Tornari                                |
| <b>Agent:</b>              | Mr Gary Arnaoutis                           |

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Refuse**

#### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS**

##### Proposed Development

This is an application for erection of a single storey rear wraparound extension.

##### Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey terraced house located on the southern end of Philip Lane. It is not in a conservation area nor is it a listed building.

Many houses around and including the application site can be seen to have side and rear extensions. The site currently has a rear extension of approximately 3m.

##### Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

HGY/2022/0949 | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 5m, for which the maximum height would be 2.8m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.7m | Not required.

HGY/2022/0507 | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3.2m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m | Refuse.

HGY/2022/0685 | Proposed dropped kerb | Approve with conditions.

HGY/2022/2094 | Certificate of lawfulness: Erection of rear dormer and outrigger roof extensions, and installation of roof lights on front slope. | Permitted Development.

## **LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

The application has been publicised by way of 10 letters. 1 objection was received by the neighbours at No. 296 Philip Lane.

The following points were raised and are material to planning consideration:

- Overbearing scale
- Impact on daylight/sunlight due to land level difference and high height of the proposal
- Out-of-Character Development
- Privacy

The above points will be discussed in subsequent sections of the report.

## **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 proposed side extension is of a substantial depth which is approximately 11.5m. It set back from the boundary by about 0.7m and creates a small courtyard to let light into the rooms on the ground floor. The side extension also wraps around the rear at a depth of 3m over the existing rear extension. This creates an overall rear extension of approximately 6m from the original house. The proposal features a double pitched roof with an eaves' height of 2.9m on both sides.

The scale of the proposal is considered to be bulky and insubordinate to the host dwelling. In comparison to other extensions in the area, the proposed extension appears to be incongruously large.

Therefore, the scheme would undermine the existing uniformity of the host building and pattern of development in the area.

As such, in design terms, the proposal is considered at odds with the above policies.

### 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.

On the boundary with No. 300, the proposed extension would add an excessive mass of about 2.9m in height over a depth of approximately 11.5m. At this depth and height, the small set back of 0.7m from the boundary is not considered sufficient to avoid having an overbearing relationship with the neighbouring property. Additionally, given that the neighbours also have an extension which is slightly set back from the boundary on their side, the proposal would create a tunnelling effect which would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

Similarly, on the boundary with No. 296 the rear extension of 3m at a height of 2.9m will also result in an overbearing relationship.

As such, in terms of impact on amenity, the proposal is considered at odds with the above policies.

#### Refusal reasons:

The proposed development by virtue of its mass would lead to a built form of an incongruous scale that would detract from the appearance of the original dwelling and harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).

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

#### **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.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE PERMISSION

#### **Refusal Reasons:**

The proposed development by virtue of its size, and massing would appear an overly bulky addition and incongruous form of development out of scale with the existing building and the local pattern of development and detrimental to the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed development by virtue of its size, and massing would have an overbearing relationship with neighbouring properties and create an unacceptable sense of enclosure, and as such would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy D14 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).