

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1433
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	11-15 Riverside Road, London N15 6DA
Proposal:	Erection of ground floor rear extensions at No's 13 and 15 and a Joint first-floor rear extension at No's 11, 13 and 15
Case Officer:	Mercy Oruwari
Valid Date:	31/05/2023
Applicant:	3
Agent:	Mr Arthur Zonszajn Shulem Posen

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

1.1 This is an application for the erection of ground floor rear extensions at No's 13 and 15 and a joint first-floor rear extension across No's 11, 13 and 15.

Site and Surroundings

1.2 The sites are mid-terraced properties located on Riverside Road. The sites are not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building. Riverside Road is within the defined area outlined in LB Haringey's 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' SPD (2013).

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

1.3 The planning history in relation to the sites is as follows:

No 11

HGY/2020/2652 - Erection of rear dormer, installation of 2 front rooflights. Granted

HGY/2004/1890 - Creation of front and rear dormer windows with rooflights to front and rear elevations. Granted

OLD/1980/1261 - 14/8/80 Erection of rear extension. Granted

OLD/1980/1260 - 22/4/80 Demolition of existing conservatory and rebuilding of slightly enlarged and given to existing planning room. Refused

OLD/1980/1259 - 11/1/80 Demolish existing conservatory and rebuild as an extension of existing mining room to provide enlarged play area for children. Also enlarge existing dining room. Refused
OLD/1979/1154 - 3/8/78 Erection of two storey side extension. Granted

No 13

HGY/2023/0205 - Erection of a Type 3 roof extension. Granted

HGY/2022/4269 - Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3.5m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m. Not required

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

No consultees

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 The application has been publicised by way of 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

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

Design and appearance

4.2 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.

4.3 Paragraph 3.42 of the Council's House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), states that two storey rear extensions are generally discouraged by the council, particularly for preservation of daylight, sunlight and from overlooking to neighbours. Notwithstanding that, the proposed extensions at Nos 11 and 15 would be set back generously from the western/eastern elevations and, taken on their own, would have a modest width in the context of the host dwelling. However, they would have no separation from the proposed full width extension at No 13. When combining all three extensions it creates the visual effect of one large element of projecting built form at the first floor level of these properties. The overall scale and bulk of the development would add considerable mass to these modest dwellings that sit within relatively small plots with small gardens. Given the scale and design at first floor level, the proposal

would not reflect the characteristics or detailing of the host dwellings and would therefore not appear subordinate to the properties.

4.4 Although the proposal does not include the ground floor extension at the rear of Nos 13 as this was approved on a previous Prior Approval application the accumulative impact would still be considered. There is also a proposed rear extension for No 15. This is of quite a modest size and would be considered an acceptable addition. The approved ground floor extension for No 13 would be approximately 6 metres deep. It has been stated that this would not need to be considered, however, as it would be in addition to the proposed first floor extensions the accumulative impact, similar to the approved type 3 extension, would still be considered when assessing the overall enlargement of the property (this would not to be determined as part of the decision as it has already been approved). When viewing the deep full width approved ground floor, and even the approved type 3 extension, combined with the full width first floor extension it would appear as excessive for the property in this small site. Once built altogether these extension would not appear subordinate to the main property.

4.5 It is important to point out that each site is dealt with on its own merit. Unlike the appeal site at 12–16 Clifton Gardens (APP/Y5420/W/22/3306428), which was referenced within the statement, there are no other extensions that span across the rear first floor level of three properties within the immediate vicinity, including at the rear within Lockmead Road, or within the adjoining rows of houses at either ends of Riverside Road. In comparison to Clifton Gardens the host sites are a lot tighter. Accordingly, the combined visual effect would be unduly dominant in context to the plot size. Taken together, the extensions would introduce significant additional bulk that would read as overwhelming on the rear facades of the dwellings. The Local Authority have taken the view that some of the issues regarding this type of proposal were not fully addressed in the appeal referenced above. Hence the same view that this type of development is not supported for the reasons above; such as the combined scale and bulk of these extensions with the full width element within a relatively small plot is overdeveloping the site.

4.6 Furthermore, a more recent planning appeal for a similar first floor rear extension spanning three properties at 35-39 Clifton Gardens (APP/Y5420/W/22/3304881), was dismissed for the reasons set out above. The inspector stated *"The proposed extension at No. 35 would have a generous set back from the western elevation and, taken on its own, would have a modest width in the context of the host dwelling. However, it would have no separation from the proposed extensions at Nos. 37 – 39, combining to create the visual effect of one large element of projecting built form at the first floor level of these properties... 17. Accordingly, the combined visual effect would be unduly dominant in context. Taken together, the extensions would introduce significant additional bulk that would read as overwhelming on the rear facades of the dwellings. The lack of separation between the extensions would also disrupt the pleasing symmetry and defining uniformity in appearance at Nos. 37-39, as well as creating an imbalance along the rear of No. 35. As such, the character of these dwellings would not be respected. 18. In this regard, the proposals would also be distinguished from the aforementioned approved schemes...(HGY/2019/3108; HGY/2016/1483; HGY/2005/2299) in Clifton Gardens, which retain an overall balanced and coherent form and design at the host dwellings. On the site-specific circumstances of the appeal before me, the proposed first floor rear extensions at the site would read as awkward, dominant and out of place additions, causing visual harm."* As mentioned above, officers consider that the combined scale and bulk of these extensions with the full width element within a relatively small plot is overdeveloping the site and as mentioned in the inspectors decision references above, would read as awkward, dominant and out of place additions, causing visual harm.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

4.7 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.

4.8 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.

4.9 Given that the first floor extension would be setback away from the boundaries of Nos 9 and 17 Riverside Road it is not considered that the amenities of the adjoining neighbouring properties would be significantly harmed.

4.10 However, when viewed from the rear gardens and windows of the habitable rooms of the immediately on facing properties at Lockmead Road, whilst set back, would appear visually overbearing and dominate the outlook from these locations. The plots are relatively small and therefore the first floor extensions would be in closer proximity to the properties at the rear, potentially impacting their privacy. For the reasons given, the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of residents of surrounding properties, with regard to outlook and privacy.

Conclusion

4.11 The proposal is considered unacceptable due to its significant additional bulk, it would fail to reflect or respect the immediate character or appearance of the host site or the area, even amongst the varied rear elevations. As such, it would read as visually overwhelming, failing to respect the proportions of the dwellings. Whilst views would be limited from surrounding streets, it would be clearly seen from immediately neighbouring properties along the otherside of Riverside Road and Lockmead Road, where its dominance would be readily apparent.

4.12 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 for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposal for the full width first-floor extensions to the rear of these properties due to the combined size, siting and design would be incongruous additions and would have a significant

adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area which would fail to comply with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021; Policy SP11 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (the LP), Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD, July 2017 (the DPD) and the House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) insofar as they seek to ensure development, including house extensions, is of a high standard of design that responds to local context and has regard to building forms and proportions.