



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2024
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	4 Antill Road, Tottenham, London, N15 4AS
Proposal:	Proposed ground floor wrap around extension and mansard roof extension.
Case Officer:	Zara Seelig
Valid Date:	26/07/2023
Applicant:	Mrs Asmeret and Grmay Yohannes and Gebreyesus
Agent:	Mr Sam De Silva

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

This is an application for a proposed Ground floor Wrap Around Extension, Mansard Roof Extension.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling situated on the Eastern side of Antill Road. The site is not located within a conservation area, it is not a listed building and there are no TPO's on the site.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

HGY/2023/0682 - Proposed Ground floor Wrap Around Extension, Mansard Roof Extension. – Refused permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be out of keeping with the general pattern and character of the area by reason of its design, impact on the street scene and general size, bulk and massing within the site, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and policies DM1 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.
2. The proposed development by reason of its height and depth along the boundary line with no. 6 would have an overbearing impact and cause a sense of enclosure, being detrimental to the amenities of this neighbouring property, contrary to policies DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and London Plan Policy D6.

3. The proposed development, by reason of the loss of daylight/sunlight caused to the central part of the property, would adversely impact the amenities of future occupants of the development, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 and policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 11 neighbour consultation 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:

Objecting: 2

Supporting: 1

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

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:

- Mansard Roof is out of keeping, there are no others in the street
- Loss of light to neighbouring properties from rear extension
- No footings should encroach neighbouring properties
- Impacts on sewerage/drainage from increase in size of dwelling
- Parking demand increase due to property being extended
- Removal of chimney stacks would alter the look and continuity of the houses
- Juliet balcony would cause overlooking
- Excessive development

The following issues were raised in representations that are not material to the determination of the application:

- The application dwelling could turn into an HMO given the number of bedrooms and bathrooms

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.

It is recognised the proposal has attempted to overcome the previous reason for refusal on design, from the street frontage, setting the roof addition back from the front has overcome the impact on the street scene as it would not be overly visible from the street. However, character and appearance also relates to the rear, there is a pleasing uniformity within the row and this proposal, relating to the mansard roof extension and the dormer extension above the outrigger, is out of character with the pattern of development within this area. The proposal would not be considered acceptable in terms of design.

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.

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.

The proposal measures 2.3 metres in height along the boundary with no. 6 with a depth of 7.8 metres. The proposal has been reduced in height from that previously refused and so would not have an overbearing impact on this neighbouring property and would not cause a sense of enclosure of the ground floor rear window closest to the boundary line with the application dwelling. The proposed Juliet balcony at roof level would cause no more overlooking than rear dormer windows. The proposed windows on the side elevations at first floor level and above would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed closed up to 1.7 metres. The proposal would therefore not adversely impact the amenities of these neighbouring properties and future occupiers by reason of overbearingness, sense of enclosure, loss of daylight/sunlight or loss of privacy.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered unacceptable due to its design and does not comply with relevant planning policies.

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.

CIL

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 for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof extensions would be out of keeping with the general pattern and character of the area by reason of their design and size, bulk and massing, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and policies DM1 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.