



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1431
Application Type:	Removal/variation of conditions
Address:	23 Norfolk Avenue, Tottenham, London, N15 6JX
Proposal:	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission HGY/2024/3318; namely to increase the height of both ridge and the eaves of the approved roof form by 0.5m
Case Officer:	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date:	20/05/202
	6
Applicant:	c/o Breakthrough Planning Ltd
Agent:	Mr Shmaya Markovits

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This application seeks to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans) attached to planning permission HGY/2024/3318 to increase the height of both ridge and eaves of the approved roof form by 0.5m.

All other aspects of the originally approved scheme remain unchanged.

The application site has permission for the erection of second floor extension with loft accommodation at third level within a gable end roof (known as Type 3 extension). As detailed in the South Tottenham SPD.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey mid - terrace house, situated on the northern side of Norfolk Avenue. Property has small lean-to single storey rear extension. Surrounding area is wholly residential in character. The property is within the defined area designated in Haringey SPD "House Extensions in South Tottenham" (2013).

Adjoining property at No.21 and other along Norfolk Avenue have similar 'Type 3 roof extensions' constructed and there are numerous examples of similar extensions including 'Type 1 and 2' along the street and surrounding roads.

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

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

- HGY/2024/3318 – Granted 30/1/2025 - Erection of Type 3 roof extension.
- HGY/2024/2342 – Granted 07/11/2024 - Formation of part basement, part ground floor rear extension.

There is no enforcement history in relation to the site.

2. Consultation response

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal: None

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 21 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

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Scope of Section 73 planning application

An application can be made under S.73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary or remove conditions associated with a planning permission. One of the uses of a S.73 application is to seek a minor material amendment, where there is a relevant condition that can be varied. A S.73 application results in a new permission being issued.

Guidance for determining S.73 applications is set out in the NPPG which states that a minor material amendment is one “whose scale and nature results in a development which is not substantially different from the one which has been approved.” This is not a statutory definition, but the Department for Levelling Up, Housing, Communities and Local Government agree with this statement. It is further stated that the development which the application under S.73 seeks to amend will by definition have been judged to be acceptable in principle at an earlier date. Consequently, the extent of the material planning considerations is somewhat restricted and only the amendments being applied for should

be considered at this stage. Having said that, when determining the application, the local planning authority (LPA) will have to consider the application in the light of current policy. The LPA therefore has to make a decision focusing on national or local policies which may have changed significantly since the original grant of planning permission as well as the merits of the changes sought.

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.

Also, relevant here is design guidance relating to facing materials, fenestration and detailing for 'Type 3' roof extensions as set out in Haringey SPD 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' (2013). This is a design led document which seeks to readdress concerns regarding the inappropriate roof extensions within the area. This guidance ensures that the design and scale of any roof extension is appropriate for the building and for the character of the area.

The application site is located within the designated area identified in Haringey SPD 'House Extension in South Tottenham' (2013). The SPD provides additional guidance on the design of house extensions being built to meet the need for providing additional habitable accommodation for large families in this part of the borough. The SPD sought to provide clear and consistent guidance on the form of roof extension defining three approved ways in which homes may be approved at roof level. This proposal is to increase the ridge and eaves height of the approved Type 3 second floor extension and given its location, the principle of this type of extension is acceptable subject to the design detailing and other consideration as outlined below.

The original SPD precipitated an increase in the number of applications for roof extension in the area, although not all extensions followed the guidance correctly. The revised SPD (October 2013) sought to provide clear and consistent guidance on the form of roof extensions; defining three approved ways in which homes may be approved at roof level. This proposal is for a 'Type 3' second floor extension. Type 3 is a full second floor extension with loft accommodation at third floor level, in material to match.

Increase the height of both ridge and eaves

Haringey SPD 'House Extension in South Tottenham' (2013) requires all proposed roof eaves match the existing eaves, with the height of the eaves above the heads of windows immediately below the same as existing. In other words, the distance from the head of the new second floor windows to the new eaves should be the same as the distance from the

head of the existing second floor windows to the old eaves [SPD para 3.129]. In this case the proposed eaves sit significantly above the head of the second-floor windows creating an elongated appearance to the building. Given the building an incongruous, elongated appearance, that the SPD guidance seeks to avoid.

Whilst there is variety in the architectural style and height of buildings in Norfolk Avenue, 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 which SPD aims to achieve.

The proposed increase to the ridge height of the roof extension would be a prominent and incongruous change which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and street scene. Therefore, making it more noticeable and prominent. The proposed increase in the ridge height of the roof would increase the bulk of the roof making it higher than adjoining buildings. The roof would thereby become more prominent. This would be particularly apparent on the front elevation 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 Norfolk Avenue. In this respect the proposal would not appear sympathetic to the existing building or the adjoining terrace.

The effect of the proposal would appear more accentuated from the opposite side of the application site along Norfolk Avenue. From this position, the proposed increase ridge height of the roof on just of the of the row of 21 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 which identified in Haringey SPD 'House Extension in South Tottenham' (2013).

The majority of extended and un-extended houses have a front eaves height just above the heads of their upper floor windows, avoiding the incongruous, elongated appearance as proposed in this case. The proposed extension to the application site should following this prevailing pattern of development within the locality. Further such incongruous development should not be encouraged.

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 Norfolk Avenue. 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 proposed roof design would appear as an intrusive addition in this street scene.

There is a currently unbroken row of properties with consistent ridge and eaves height, 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

increase to ridge and eaves would interrupt. The proposal would also harm the character and appearance of the group of terraces.

The 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, and advice contained within the Haringey SPD 'House Extension in South Tottenham' (2013) concerning sensitive design quality and respecting the character of the buildings which, amongst other matters, which requires residential extensions to complement the street scene.

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. 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.

The increase in ridge and eaves height of the roof 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.

5 Conclusion

The proposal is considered unacceptable. The proposed increase to ridge height by reason of its design 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 locality and fails to comply with guidelines set out in adopted guidance (House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD October 2013). 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).

The proposed development, by reason of the roof eaves height not matching the proportions and guidelines set out in adopted guidance, with the height of the eaves significantly above the heads of the property's upper floor windows , would appear an incongruous form of development out of character with the majority of extended, and un-extended properties in the street, to the detriment of local visual amenity, contrary to paragraph 3.129 of the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD October 2013, and thereby contrary to policies DM1

and DM12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Strategic Policy SP11 of Strategic Local Plan 2017.

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.

6. 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.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed increase to the ridge height by reason of its design 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 locality and fails to comply with guidelines set out in adopted guidance (House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD October 2013). 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).

The proposed development, by reason of the roof eaves height not matching the proportions and guidelines set out in adopted guidance, with the height of the eaves significantly above the heads of the property's upper floor windows, would appear an incongruous form of development out of character with the majority of extended, and un-extended properties in the street, to the detriment of local visual amenity, contrary to paragraph 3.129 of the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD October 2013, and thereby contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Strategic Policy SP11 of Strategic Local Plan 2017.