



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2174
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	95 Wood Vale, Hornsey, London, N10 3DL
Proposal:	Proposed ground floor rear extension, replacement of existing side extension with new side extension, replacement windows and doors, new Juliet balcony on first floor rear elevation and alteration to current rear dormer, installation of new rooflight removal of existing exterior paintwork and pebbledash render (AMENDED DESCRIPTION).
Case Officer:	Josh Parker
Valid Date:	10/08/2023
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Joseph
Agent:	Mr Patrick Owens

1. SITE AND SURROUNDING

The subject site is a two-storey detached dwelling in use as a family home located on the southern side of Wood Vale. The area is comprised of other residential buildings, detached and semi-detached, of relative common architectural design; namely early twentieth century properties. The application site is not located within a conservation area.

The application site slopes from front to back and backs onto the Crouch End Open Space/ designated MOL. The property has an existing attic conversion with rear dormer.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application is for the following works:

- Proposed ground floor rear extension;
- Replacement of existing side extension with new side extension;

- Replacement windows and doors;
- New Juliet balcony on first floor rear elevation and alteration to current rear dormer;
- The installation of a new rooflight on the side of the property's roof; and
- The removal of existing exterior paintwork and pebbledash render.

It is pointed out that some of the external alterations to the appearance of this property (i.e. the replacement of windows and doors and removal of pebbledash render) falls within the scope of 'permitted development', as such not technically requiring planning permission, but are included within this application to record/ show the full extent of the works proposed.

The application has been amended from that submitted, namely by omitting the basement floor and associated excavation works. Equally the revised plans have changed the rear extension and moved external steps further in from the shared boundary.

3. SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT

The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision.

HGY/2012/0037 - Installation of solar PV panels to rear dormer roof. Approved 16/02/2012.

4. 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 is as follows:

No of individual responses:

Objecting: 38 (including 33 signature petition)

Supporting: 0

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association

The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- Cllr Connor

The following issues were raised in representations and are addressed further on in this report or below:

Basement & construction works

- Complicated local soil and underground water courses, tributaries and culvert etc;
- Underground streams are a major issue in the area;
- Surface flooding is a known risk in Wood Vale;
- Geo-hydrological risks;
- Flood risk and drainage impacts;
- Insufficient information has been provided, in respect of basement works, flood risk, water course and construction;
- Absence of third-party study addressing the local hydrology;
- Works will cause instability and potentially affect the structural integrity of neighbouring houses;
- No precedent for basements on Wood Vale or Cranley Gardens;

(Comment: As outlined above the basement works has been removed from the scheme)

Design & heritage

- Size and scale of this extension is at odds with other houses on this street;
- Existing side extension is made up of two separate spaces;
- Proposed rear extension is monolithic in bulk and scale;
- Amended plans are disproportionate and detracts from the established character of the locality;
- Houses were originally detached and once the garage is demolished the rights to the party wall will be relinquished;
- Substantial new raised terrace;
- Electronic gates and paved front drives are not appropriate for the character of the street;
- Removing the pebbledash from the first floor will negatively impact the street scene;
- No objection to reasonable redevelopments and expansions of houses in Wood Vale;
- Overdevelopment / urbanising of site;
- New hardstanding and effect on drainage/ run-off;

(Comment: The electric gates have been removed from the scheme. A proposal to install retractable bollards may be a means of enclosure not requiring planning permission, subject to meeting the limitations of Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) England Order 2015, in specific subject to not exceeding 1m in height).

Amenity

- Impact on residential amenity/ loss of light;
- Extension blocks 45 degree Right to Light to No 93;
- Heights and levels of new rear extension relative to surroundings not shown;
- Overlooking from extension and porch;
- impacts of noise, vibration, dust and site waste;
- Large size of this project will mean that the work will continue for many years;
- Excessive noise nuisance, pollution;
- Impacts of noise, vibration, dust and site waste;
- Pollution and microclimatic conditions;
- Disruption to road with heavy lorries delivering materials;
- Disruption from the basement extension would be significant;

(Comment: As outlined above the extent of the works here have significantly reduced.)

Environmental impacts

- Effect on the local biodiversity, trees, nature and fauna;
- Impact on adjoining Metropolitan Open Land, the Nature reserves of Queens Wood, Crouch End Open Space and Shepherds Hill allotments, which are protected and of important environmental value;
- Air and light pollution;

Other

- The red boundary line to No 93 is still drawn incorrectly;
- Location of AC units not clear;
- No visit to neighbour sites to assess application.

(Comments: A site visit to the property was undertaken on the 6th of October to understand the context of the site and impact on amenity

As per the plans submitted the extension will be built up to the boundary with the side extension having its own side wall as opposed to adjoining the side wall of No 93. Legally a building owner can build right up to the boundary, however foundations which astride would require a party wall agreement, with this consent or the drawings approved not conveying such consent. An informative is being imposed to remind the applicant/ agent of the need for a party wall agreement).

The AC units have been removed from the application.)

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance,
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
3. Impact on adjoining open space/ MOL, trees and ecology.

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

As amended the proposal here is for a ground floor rear extension and the replacement of an existing side extension with a new side extension.

The character of Wood Vale consists of large, detached, and semi-detached properties of the early twentieth century period in terms of design and appearance. The backs of properties to this part of Wood Vale are of generous gardens enclosed by planting on shared boundaries. Specifically, the gardens here are undulating sloping somewhat north-west to south-east with a mixture of roof modifications, patio areas and extensions to the back of these two-storey houses.

Alterations to the front of the site

In respect of the front façade the works here would not take from the early twentieth century character associated with this site. The front elevation would be respected with the installation of the faux garage door to the side extension. As reflected above the replacement of windows and doors and removal of pebbledash render) would fall within the scope of 'permitted development' but are included within this application to record/ show the full extent of the works proposed. As reflected in the amended

description and amended plans for this application, the scheme here no longer proposes to install electric gates to the front of the site.

Side extension

The proposed works to the side would largely adopt the footprint of the existing garage and structures currently in situ along the eastern side of the boundary. Similar to the existing garage structure when viewed from the street, the side extension would appear a well subservient feature with an appropriate visual gap above the single storey structures here to Nos 93 and 95 still remaining, as such protecting visual gaps between buildings.

Questions have been raised on whether the current side structures have been constructed legitimately or not, however there is evidence to show this has been in situ for many years.

Rear extension

Various iterations to the drawings have been submitted, in specific amending the extent of the works to the rear of the property following advice from Officers.

The works to the rear now in effect involve internalising the previous deck area and a portion of rear garden to create additional living space. The works to the rear would extend the building by approximately 4.0m from the original rear building line, with an extension of a flat roof design. The extension seeks to enhance the living quarters by means of allowing more natural light and adding floorspace. The works also serves to make the dwelling more energy efficient by retaining heat effectively through means of better glazing, insulation and materials.

The rear extension would have a contemporary appearance by reason of its flat roof design and large areas of glazing. It would extend across the full width of the house up to the party wall with No 93. Its contemporary appearance is viewed acceptable in the context of a rear garden setting, with contemporary extensions common to other properties on this road.

Although higher than a typical extension which can be built under 'permitted development', the extension as per the amended plans is a subordinate addition. Specifically, as per the amended plans the floor level to the rear extension sits lower than that to the main part of the house, as such appearing subordinate in relation to the main dwelling. The extension is also viewed to be proportionate and subordinate in relation to site area, with a generous rear garden retained with space for shrub and trees etc.

In terms of the concerns raised about building lines and the projection of the works here into the rear garden of the application site, the properties here are not characterised by rigid building lines, rather the footprint and position of houses in their respective plot vary somewhat. A 4m extension (the typical 'permitted development allowance for a detached house), with an associated area of hardstanding beyond this for sitting out etc, is viewed to be proportionate in relation to this property and plot, with this reduced in size during the application process.

A generous rear garden is retained beyond the extension and area of hardstanding, with the backdrop and prevailing character of the woodlands/ open space to the rear still fully appreciated.

As such it is concluded that the size, scale and design of the rear and side extensions are acceptable and not harmful to the character and appearance of this existing house and the surrounding 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. 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.

As per the objections' received concerns were raised in respect of impact on the residential amenity to No 93. In terms of loss of sunlight/ daylight, the photos provided in the objection received regarding No. 93, serve to show that there will be no adverse impact on amenity. The photos provided show that the additional volume of the extension over and above the height of the current boundary wall will not be significant as the extension has been further reduced in height. The extension would be too low in height to lead to a material loss of light, with this bay window in the context of all its glazing continuing to provide good levels of light and outlook to this room. Equally the position and height of such an extension would not materially affect air circulation to No 93 nor is there any evidence to support the notion that it would lead to 'microclimatic conditions'.

In considering this application and the impact on the window in question, a side window to a bay, it also needs to be borne in mind that with most suburban properties outlook and light to side windows will be in part constrained by adjacent boundaries and vegetation, as such providing more limited sources of light and outlook, compared to front and rear facing windows. This is equally fully reflected in the tests set out in national guidance on daylight and sunlight, known as BRE "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice" (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011), which equally has guidance on considering impacts on bay windows, which are not viewed to be breached here.

In relation to No 97 there is a separating gap between the side of the rear extension and this property, as well as a slight difference in levels between these sites. As such there will be no adverse impact on the amenity to this property, in terms of daylight/sunlight and outlook and no sense of enclosure created.

It is noted that concerns have also been raised in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy. Officers would point out that the proposed development would have a similar relationship as per the rest of the housing stock along the road, namely rear facing windows facing into a private rear garden with adequate fencing along shared boundaries to minimise overlooking/ loss of privacy. Equally the alterations to the current rear dormer and addition of a Juliet balcony on the first floor rear elevation are not significant, in the context of existing glazing to upper floor windows and mutual overlooking between properties, namely into gardens from upper floor windows

It is recognised that concerns have been raised in relation to noise and disturbance. While these concerns are noted it would not be possible to withhold consent on such grounds (i.e. in the context of planning legislation) but equally noise from construction is temporary in nature. Equally given the relative scale of the works here, householder extensions, there is no policy basis to ask for the submission of a Construction Management Plan.

Notwithstanding different safeguards in other forms of legislation, the Control of Pollution Act 1974, Building regulation etc will apply here. In relation to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 the underlying legal principle of controlling noise and vibration on a site is that the activities should be undertaken in a manner which demonstrates the Best Practicable Means (BPM), as defined in the Act. The legislation also restricts hours of working to mitigate the effects of noise and vibration on sensitive receptors. An informative has been added reminding the applicant of this requirement.

Overall, it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. As such, the scheme is considered to be in accordance with policies outlined above.

Impact on adjoining open space/ MO, trees & ecology:

DM Policy (2017) DM19 states the development proposals on sites which are, or are adjacent Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation or Ecological Corridors, should protect. The application site backs onto open space that is designated Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). This is known as Crouch End Open Space, which form a part of extensive networks of open spaces found in this immediate area.

Given the scale of the development as described above and its distance away from the boundary with the open space/ MOL, it would not intrude into or affect the qualities and openness of this adjoining land.

Specifically, the introduction of a rear extension to the back of this property with area of hard surfacing beyond it, is well separated from the back of this site and like other rear extensions to the backs of properties, has no consequential impact for the protected open space found beyond the rear boundary fence of this site. The undeveloped and sylvan qualities of this space and views of it from neighbouring properties would not be affected.

Concerns have been raised in relation to light spillage, however this would not be significant in the context of this existing house/ existing housing facing into rear gardens enclosed by fencing.

In terms of loss of vegetation and biodiversity in respect of this garden this is not significant in the context of this rear garden, with the scale of the works almost falling within the limitation of 'permitted development'. As noted above a generous rear garden is retained with space for shrub and trees etc.

Conclusion:

The rear and side extension as amended will be subordinate to this original dwelling in both scale and size and does not represent a disproportionate addition to this building/ plot. The extension would not materially impact neighbour amenity in terms of conditions of light and outlook and privacy, nor be overbearing. The extensions and works here equally has no consequential impact for the protected open space found beyond the rear boundary fence of this site.

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.

6. 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.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Grant permission subject to 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 and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission. 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 those specified in the application submission, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. 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.
4	No part of any structure hereby granted shall be used as a roof terrace or balcony. Reason: In order to restrict the use of the premises to one compatible with the surrounding area because other uses within the same Use Class or another Use Class are not necessarily considered to be acceptable consistent with Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017
Informatives:	
	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: 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: 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.