



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2317
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	41 Grand Avenue, Hornsey, London, N10 3BS
Proposal:	Partial excavation of the lower ground floor and creation of new entrance at lower level, single story infill extension to rear, redesign and rebuild of the existing closet wing, loft external re-cladding, roof light amendments to the front roof pitch, various upgrades to roof finishes on the front and rear roof pitch and replacement of windows.
Case Officer:	Josh Parker
Valid Date:	29/08/2023
Applicant:	Mr M Bar Yosef
Agent:	Ms Prudence de Wynter

SITE AND SURROUNDING

The subject property at 41 Grande Avenue is a two-storey mid-terraced building in use as a single dwelling. The area is comprised of other residential Edwardian styled buildings comprised of red brick. The building is located within the Muswell Hill conservation area.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The applicant is proposing the following works:

- Partial excavation of the lower ground floor and creation of new entrance at lower level, single story infill extension to rear, redesign and rebuild of the existing closet wing,
- Loft external re-cladding,
- Roof light amendments to the front roof pitch,
- Various upgrades to roof finishes on the front and rear roof pitch,
- replacement windows throughout with new timber.

SITE HISTORY/ENFORCEMENT

The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision. Neighbouring properties have received permission for extensions, dormers and alterations.

CONSULTATION

LBH Conservation - No comments were received.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by the 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:

Objections:2

Support: 0

Concerns raised:

1. Further questions on if the proposal may have negative effects on the daylight through the neighbouring No 43's rear doors/windows.

Officers comments: The proposed works are modest in nature and would be close to permitted the development allowance when considering the new extension on the boundary shared with No 34.

2. loft windows will clash with the style of loft extensions and their windows along the terrace.

Officers comments: The contemporary, high quality zinc may have a difference presence to the existing however, can also be seen as an improvement.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and impact on the character and appearance of Muswell Hill conservation area,
2. Basement works;
3. Impact on amenity.

Design and heritage

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. DPD Policy D9 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

The works propose a rear infill extension and replacement of the existing closet extension. The replacement of the existing closet extension will retain a similar footprint stretching approximately 6.4m from the rear of the original building at a width of 3.1m and maximum height of 3.0m and 3.7m for the party wall parapet (existing) which stretches approximately 4.4m. The proposed roof would run north and west with a skylight setback on by the original dwelling. The small infill extension would be 3.0m in depth, 3.6m in width and a maximum of 3.2m (parapet) with a 3.0m high flat green roof with a skylight.

Moreover, there would be additional landscaping works to the rear to improve the rear garden and introduce new patio space and revamp the rear dormer fabric. Additionally, the dormer would have the pebble dash finish removed to add a new black zinc seam cladding and a new black aluminium window.

There has been a question raised regarding how the new zinc cladding and window would relate to the supporting dormers and dwellinghouses on the terrace. Officers note that there is no consistency or rhythm when considering the rear dormers in relation to the terrace and the removal of the pebble dash finish would be welcomed. Observations with the proportions of the new window being larger than the rest of the terrace would not materially be unacceptable. Although there would be somewhat of a contrast with the surrounding dormers, the colour and material finish would have a neutral effect on the rear and wider area, blending in with the roofscape.

Works to the front elevation involve replacement windows throughout with new timber double glazed sash windows painted in a dark grey. Officers view that given the prevalence of white framed windows on this road, the replacement windows here should match the existing, as is required as per condition 4 imposed.

The existing bay windows and roof clay tiles would be replaced 'like for like' and the front roof pitch will be upgraded to a slate tile in place of the existing plain concrete tiles with 4 new skylights spaced aesthetically over the front slope. Brickwork would also be repointed and cleaned. The larger works to the front elevation would involve widening and deepening and lower ground to create an additional 5m² by lowering it 1.5m. Access would be created using matching brick works and door to match the existing. Considering the setback from the street front, front garden, exiting elevation and materials used the new access would not create unacceptable harm from the street scape. All of the basement works would be largely hidden and not materially affect the front elevation or the character and appearance of the property.

The proposed works are modest and sensitive in nature and will enhance the conditions of the dwellinghouse with the introduction a better layout and additional space. The scheme is acceptable when assessed against the aforementioned policies leaving the character and appearance of the conservation area preserved.

Basement works

Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan requires that new development should ensure that impacts on natural resources, among other things, are minimised by adopting sustainable construction techniques.

DPD policy DM18 ('Residential Basement Development and Light Wells') requires householder extensions for basement development to demonstrate that a proposal will not adversely affect the structural stability of the application building and neighbouring buildings; does not increase flood risk to the property and nearby properties; avoids harm to the established character of the surrounding area and not to adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties or the local natural and historic environment.

London Plan 2021 policy relates more specifically to large-scale basement development but in paragraph 3.10.6 it is recognised and outlined that small-scale basement excavations, where they are appropriately designed and constructed, can contribute to the efficient use of land, and provide extra living space. Paragraph 3.10.5 equally highlights the need to manage sensitively through the planning application process potential impact on the local environment and residential amenity.

The building has an existing lower ground floor to the front. A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has not been submitted with the application however we can see other examples of similar works in the terrace. The proposed excavation to the existing basement would result in a 1.5m additional depth, at a total of 5sqm deep. This will allow for a 2.4m internal ceiling height and for the lower floors to be reconfigured with the utility and coat room in the new basement area.

The site is not within a Critical Drainage Area and therefore there is no obvious risk of flooding which is a large component of Policy DM18. The works here are largely contained within the existing footprint of the house. As such as there is only a very modest increase in the proportion of hard surfacing on site, meaning surface water discharged to the ground will not be adversely affected.

It is important to bear in mind that this is the least complex type of retro-fit basement development, as opposed to a new single level basement, multi-level basement or the large basement projecting into a garden. Mindful of the existing void space here, the differential between the existing and proposed foundations will not be significant. Such works do not represent a significant structural stability hazard, on the grounds of using industry standard underpinning in advance of the excavation below the current void. Such works to the party wall would in effect be very similar to typical underpinning works/ foundations repair, where foundations are taken below the swelling and shrinkage zone of London Clay, so as to reduce the risk of damage caused by the water consumption of trees in a shrinkable soil as well as due to normal seasonal movement.

As with all basement projects more intrusive aspect of basement design and construction takes place after the planning process. Other legislation provides further safeguards to identify and control the nature and magnitude of the effect on neighbouring properties. In specific the structural integrity of the proposed basement works here would need to satisfy modern day building regulations. In addition, the necessary party-wall agreements with adjoining owners would need to be in place prior to the commencement of works on site. In this instance a condition is being imposed to ensure that works are overseen by a suitably qualified engineer.

Amenity Comments

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.

Mentioned above the extensions are of a moderate size and replacing existing. The 3.2m height for the parapet on the party wall shared with No 43 has raised concern in regard to the effects on daylight the extension would have on their rear bay windows. As the dwelling is subject to article 4 the site would be eligible to construct this extension with a maximum height of 3.0m. As such Officers accepts that although there will be some level impact on the daylighting with the max height being 3.2m with a depth of 3.0m, it would not justify a refusal.

It is noted that the dormer window proportions have changed slightly however materially, the larger window would have the same impact with regard to overlooking.

All works proposed meet all amenity tests when considering effects on light, bulk, sense of enclosure and privacy for the observations discussed above.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable in design and heritage terms. 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.