



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1885
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	449A West Green Road, Tottenham, London, N15 3PL
Proposal:	Erection of additional second storey and a mansard roof to create separate self-contained flats
Case Officer:	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date:	14/07/2023
Applicant:	Mr Kalkan
Agent:	Mr Ates

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a second – floor and mansard roof extension over the existing pitched roof to provide self-contained flat consisting of 2 bedroom, 3-person maisonette unit across the second and mansard roof level.

Site and Surroundings

1.2 The application site is a two-storey mid terrace property situated on southern side of West Green Road, close to the junction with Haringay Road. The surrounding area is predominantly commercial units on the ground floor with residential accommodation above, further south and north of the site are mainly residential in character.

1.3 The site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

1.5 There is no recent planning or enforcement planning history in relation to the site.

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

Internal:

1) LBH Transportation Team: No objection subject to conditions.

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 The application has been publicised by way of 16 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: 16

Objecting: 16

Supporting: 0

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

Objections

- The three - storey design is not in keeping with the other houses on this row of terraces. If the changes are made it will completely compromise the integrity of the design of this section of street. It is crucial that the historical design of these streets is respected - once these changes are made, we can-not reverse them. The examples of other properties in this application are completely different as the surrounding houses are at the same level. Such a dramatic alteration and addition to the terrace should not be allowed.
- It fails to respect the integrity and design of the Edwardian / Victorian properties in this section of street, especially with such a dramatic alteration and addition to the terrace.
- The proposed development is totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties and destroys the unique urban grain. The building is proportionally oversized and much too domineering for this unique terrace of shops.
- We totally object to this proposal as we feel that the scale of the proposed development is totally out of character and scale with the adjoining buildings to the left and diminishes the impact of the corner building on the right.
- The proposed design is not in keeping with the rest of the buildings in the area and will grossly affect the way the row of buildings looks and change the character of the area.
- Strongly object to this planning application on the grounds that the extra storeys are not compatible with the adjoining properties.
- Proposed plans do not account for the building context and should be rejected. It does not "relate positively to neighbouring structures",

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Principle of development.
2. Design and appearance.
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Principle of development

4.2 London Plan (2021) Policy H2A outlines a clear presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and sets out a minimum target in Table 4.2 for boroughs (Haringey –10-year target is 2,600).

4.3 London Plan Policy D3 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services.

4.4 The principle of altering the existing building is acceptable, subject to it having a good design, being subordinate in scale to the existing building and it is having no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. The provision of additional housing at this location would be supported by policy SP2 of the Local Plan which seeks to meet and exceed the borough housing targets through the provision of additional housing in suitable locations as in this instance.

Design and appearance

4.5 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.

4.6 No.433 – 451 West Green Road consisting of 8 row of terrace and is two storeys building of uniform design or arranged in small groups of similar character and appearance. The properties are such a group in the form of a short terrace with consistent design features with the exception of No.451 West Green Road (this existing building on the site marks the corner by sitting a storey taller than adjoining terraces). This corner property at junction with Harringay Road is historic and has the luxury of being taller.

4.7 Whilst there is variety in the architectural style and height of buildings in West Green Road, the application site is a prominent focal point in the locality due to its uniform design and finish within the row of terrace. From this view, the unaltered and consistent appearance of the roofscape is readily apparent. The open, undeveloped roof contributes to the character and appearance of the group and to the quality of the street scene. The addition of development in the form of a raised roof to one part of the terrace would upset its existing uniformity and consistent appearance. Despite the height of the corner property, most appear to be unaltered and have retained their original built form. Although no. 451 West Green Road is of a distinctive character to the rest of the terrace in terms of its, roofs and façade design – but relates well to the rest of the terrace and application site. In this setting the proposed roof extension would be a prominent and incongruous change which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and street scene.

4.8 The primary concern relates to the design of mansard roof alteration. The application site is one of 8 adjoining terrace houses each having a simple roof detail. The adjoining buildings in common with others in this terrace have a pitched. The proposed mansard roof and front dormers would be set back behind the parapet. The building is prominently located close to a road junction and is higher than other building adjoining within the rows of terrace with parapet. It is therefore more noticeable and prominent. The proposed roof extension would increase the bulk of the roof making it higher than adjoining buildings. The roof would thereby become more prominent. Despite replicating the ridgeline of the neighbouring historic corner property, the bulk and mass of the

proposed mansard would be much greater than these neighbouring properties. This would be particularly apparent on the north elevation where parapet is raised and would be visible within the street scene. The proportion of the additional mass above the parapet of the existing roof would appear out of scale or dominating from West Green Road. In this respect the proposal would not appear sympathetic to the existing building or the adjoining terrace.

4.9 The effect of the proposal would appear more accentuated from the opposite side of the application site along West Green Road. From this position, the proposed mansard roof on just of the of the row of six mid terrace houses seen above the parapet, without being repeated others, would unbalance the appearance these other rows of building and appear out of place, and fail to contribute to the distinctive character of the area.

4.10 Whilst it is acknowledged that the aim of the proposal is to make better use of the existing host building. However, for the reason set out above, the extension would not appear subservient to the main building. Due to the prominence of the terrace location the proposal would appear unduly dominant and incongruous, particularly when viewed from West Green Road. Although localised in its extent, the effect of the proposal would unacceptably diminish the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In this respect, the proposal roof design would appear as an intrusive addition in this street scene.

4.11 There is a currently unbroken row of properties with pitched roofs, which define a unifying pattern to the front and rear elevations of this group when viewed from both the small garden area behind and from high level views from surrounding properties within the area. The host building exhibits a completed and balanced composition which an additional storey would interrupt. The proposal for a mansard extension at no. 449A would also harm the character and appearance of the group of terraces.

4.12 Proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it is a part and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to the following policies of the Council's Local Plan and Development Management DPD, concerning sensitive design quality and respecting the character of the buildings which, amongst other matters, which requires residential extensions to complement the street scene. These policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section seven concerning good design.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

4.13 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.

4.14 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.

4.15 The additional floors would not have a significant impact on privacy. There would be no significant harm to the amenities of the adjacent occupiers, as the proposal extends upwards only and within the existing footprint of the host building.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

4.16 London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to be of high-quality design, providing comfortable and functional layouts, benefiting from sufficient daylight and sunlight, maximising the provision of dual aspect units and providing adequate and easily accessible storage space as well as outdoor amenity space. Table 3.1 sets out the internal minimum space standards for new developments, while Table 3.2 of the London Plan provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments.

4.17 Proposed flat would accord with minimum standards and would be afforded an adequate level light and outlook. Provides internal floor space of 84 sq.m.

Conclusion

4.18 The proposal is considered not acceptable. The proposed mansard roof extension by reason of its design, size, scale, and siting would be an incongruous and unsympathetic feature that would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and wider area. The extension would result in an undesirable visual feature when observed from the front/rear and would be harmful to the appearance of the host building. This would set unwanted precedent in the passage that is two-storey in nature. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (adopted 2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

4.19 The proposed roof alteration, by reason of its scale, design and appearance, would be an intrusive and unduly prominent addition in the street scene, out of scale and character with this and neighbouring dwellings, as well as having an adverse effect on the visual amenities of the locality, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (adopted 2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

4.20 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 development is less than 100 square metres but is for a whole new unit and as such is liable for CIL. Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £5,422.20 (84sqm x £64.55) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £20,587.56 (84sqm x £245.09 (Indexation included)). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed additional storey and mansard roof extension by reason of its scale, design and appearance, would be an intrusive and unduly prominent addition in the street scene, out of scale and character with this and neighbouring dwellings, as well as having an adverse effect on the

visual amenities of the locality, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (adopted 2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).