



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1061
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Flat 1, 41 Palace Road, Wood Green, London, N11 2PU
Proposal:	Alterations to existing single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey infill rear extension.
Case Officer:	Mark Chan
Valid Date:	15/04/2026
Applicant:	Miss Dalila Nobile
Agent:	Mr Matthew Riley

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPEMNT

This is an application for the erection of a single-storey rear/side infill extension to the ground floor flat, infilling most of the space between the property's rear outrigger and the boundary with the neighbouring property at No. 39 Palace Road, leaving a small courtyard at the base of the side return.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site is a two storey, mid-terraced dwellinghouse that has been converted into 2 separate flats on the southern side of Palace Road. The proposal relates to the ground floor flat. The site is not within a conservation area nor in the vicinity of a listed building.

The proposal relates to works at ground floor level only and does not alter the lawful use of the property.

3. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

None relevant.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

Two objections have been received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application. The reasons for objections are summarised as follows:

- Overshadowing and loss of light (Officer comment: To be addressed in the report)
- Loss of Outlook and visual amenity (Officer comment: To be addressed in the report)
- Loss of privacy and overlooking (Officer comment: To be addressed in the report)
- Noise and general disturbance (Officer comment: To be addressed in the report)
- High risk of structural impact on neighbouring property (Officer comment: The structural integrity and physical safety of buildings are matters controlled separately under the Building

Regulations regime and through private legal processes where applicable. Any structural works associated with the development must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Building Regulations and any necessary structural engineer's details. Furthermore, it is not considered the new infill rear extension would adversely impact the structure of No. 39 Palace Road given its small scale and positioned entirely within the application site.)

- Proposed rooflights may structurally weaken the roof (Officer comment: The structural integrity and physical safety of a building are Building Regulations matters, not planning considerations.)
- Insufficient consultation time (Officer comment: Consultation letters were sent to neighbouring properties, including Flat 1 and 2, 41 Palace Road on 14/05/2026. Sufficient consultation time was allowed.)

4. 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.

The application property, like the neighbour to the south, has a relatively short two storey outrigger with a flat-roofed single storey extension on the end. This proposal is to replace the single storey extension and infill the space between the outrigger and the extension would be build up to the boundary with No. 39 Palace Road, leaving a small courtyard at the base of the side return.

The infill extension would only marginally extend beyond the end of the extension to No. 39's outrigger. It would have a pitched roof, sloping down towards the boundary with No. 39. It is intended that the flank of the extension would be a party wall shared with the neighbours, with a parapet height of approximately 2.3m above the neighbours external ground level adjacent to the extension.

It is advised that separate to planning consent, permission for construction up to or adjacent to the shared boundary require compliance with the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and any necessary agreement(s) with adjoining owners would be a civil matter outside the scope of the planning process.

The proposal includes rebuilding the existing single storey rear extension. It would not increase in depth and would have a flat roof. The height of the new extension would be similar to the height of the existing projection and would remain flush with the neighbouring extension.

The rear elevation of the infill extension and rebuilt extension would be finished in a brick to match that of the existing property with a bifold patio door. The extension would be appropriately subordinate and respectful in its scale, massing and external materials.

It is noted that there are a wide variety of additions in terms of their scale, form and design to the rear of properties on this stretch of Palace Road. The proposal would therefore not look out of place and would be sufficient quality to protect local character and the visual amenity of the area.

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 is not considered to have any adverse impact on amenities of No. 43 Palace Road as the footprint of the rear extension would remain the same and the boundary is not affected on this side. In addition, as shown in the Section drawings, the roof height of the proposed rear extension has been reduced to maintain a consistent internal ceiling level.

As for potential impact on the amenities of No. 39, the flank wall of the proposed infill extension has been deliberately kept low in height at 2.3m along the shared boundary and would sit within the shadow of the existing two-storey rear outrigger and ground floor element. Furthermore, it is observed that the floor levels at No. 39 are elevated compared to the application site and the rear facing window of No. 39 is already raised. Given the approximately 1.9m distance between the side facing windows to the boundary and combined with their elevated position, the infill extension would not intercept a 45-degree line drawn from the top of the extension in relation to the inner rear window. It is also noted that the rear elevation of No. 39 is served by multiple windows and as such, has multiple points of aspect/light intake. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring occupiers.

Given the close relationship between the proposed extension and the neighbouring property at No. 39 Palace Road, careful construction management will be important to minimise temporary impacts during building works. Matters such as construction noise, dust, vibration and working hours would be controlled through separate Environmental Health and Building Control legislation where necessary.

Given the modest scale of the proposed extension and no new windows are proposed along the boundary, it would not result in any materially significant impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, outlook and daylight/sunlight and is in compliance with the above policies. It is also not considered the proposed development would generate additional noise and disturbance that would materially impact neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and neighbouring amenity and complies with relevant planning policies.

The proposal would not prejudice the continued residential use or enjoyment of adjoining properties, subject to the development being implemented in accordance with approved plans and relevant statutory requirements.

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

5. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sqm. and therefore, the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

6. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following condition(s)

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans listed below, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission or where alternative details have been subsequently approved following an application for a non-material amendment. :

- S0115-00-EX-001 - Site Location Plan R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-200 Proposed Plans 01 R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-201 Proposed Ground Floor Plan R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-202 Proposed Roof Plan R2-01
- S0114-00-GA-301 Proposed Rear Elevation R2-01
- S0114-00-GA-302 Proposed Side Elevation 01 R2-01
- S0114-00-GA-303 Proposed Side Elevation 02 R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-401 Proposed Section AA R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-402 Proposed Section BB R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-403 Proposed Section CC R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-404 Proposed Section DD R2-01
- S0115-00-GA-405 Proposed Section EE R2-01

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building except where otherwise stated on the approved plans.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.