



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2469
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	11 Ermine Road, Tottenham, London, N15 6DB
Proposal:	Alterations to the front elevation and enlargement to front balcony.
Case Officer:	Zara Seelig
Valid Date:	22/09/2023
	3
Applicant:	Mike Kahan
Agent:	Mr. Heshy Friedman

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

Alterations to the front elevation and enlargement to front balcony.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a three storey end of terrace building consisting situated on the western side of Ermine 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

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

HGY/2023/0532 - Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3.5m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m – Not required

HGY/2023/0533 - Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed dormer extension on the property's rear roof slope and roof lights on the front roof slope. – Lawful

HGY/2023/0869 – Erection of Part Ground and First floor rear extension – Refused permission

HGY/2023/0967 - Alterations to the front elevation. – Approved with conditions (following removal of balcony extension and front windows at first and second floor)

HGY/2023/0975 – Excavation of basement with rear lightwells under the rear extension – Granted Permission

HGY/2023/1775 - Alterations to the front elevation. – Approved with conditions (following removal of front windows at first and second floor)

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal: None

External: None

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 3 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:

Supporting: None

Objecting: None

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:

- None

The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- None

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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.

The design of the proposed front ground floor infill extension is acceptable, there is an existing front extension similar to that applied for under this application that appears to have been in situ for 6 + years and has been approved twice recently under application ref: HGY/2023/0967 and HGY/2023/1775. The proposal is identical to that previously considered unacceptable as submitted under HGY/2023/0967 and has the same front windows previously considered under application ref: HGY/2023/1775, both the front balcony extension and the proposed windows at first and second floor were removed as part of those applications and considered to then be acceptable. The proposal is considered unacceptable for the previous reasons raised. The street scene, within which the proposed site lies, is uniform and

Page 2 of 4

consistent. The agent has provided an example of a similar development at no. 66 Plevna Crescent, this site is not only situated on the other side of the train track to the application site, and so not in direct vicinity of the application site, but it is also an example of poor development and not one the council would wish to replicate. The proposed ground floor front infill extension as discussed above would be considered acceptable, however, the proposed balcony extension and the proposed windows on the first and second floor front elevation are considered out of character, upset the uniformity within the row and would adversely impact the street scene. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to policy and is not considered acceptable.

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.

This proposed front roof terrace extension would cause overlooking to the neighbouring property of no. 12's balcony area to the front due to the proposal being built right up to the balcony of no. 12. The proposal would not adversely impact the amenities of neighbouring properties by reason of overbearingness, loss of daylight/sunlight, however, it would result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring property no. 12. The proposal does not comply with relevant policy and is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

Other matters

To note, there has been significant engagement between officers and the agent/agents on all 2023 applications for this site. We have previously engaged with the agent requesting amendments that have been made in order to come to a positive recommendation for approval on 4 of the 5 applications and have actively engaged with the agent throughout, going above and beyond as part of the planning process. In this instance on this proposal, as the same identical proposal was previously considered unacceptable twice and included engagement by myself, it was not considered engagement was necessary in this instance due to the issues having already been highlighted previously.

Conclusion

The proposal is not considered acceptable in terms of its design and impact on neighbouring amenity 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 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.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development would be out of keeping with the general pattern and character of the area by reason of the proposed front roof terrace extension and addition of windows at first and second floor level on the front elevation appearing at odds and jarring with the uniform character and pattern of development within the row and the street scene, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and policies DM1 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposed development, by reason of its proposed front roof terrace extending up to the boundary with the existing balcony at no. 12 would have an adverse impact by reason of an element of overlooking/loss of privacy due to the close proximity of the two balconies at the same level. This would be detrimental to the amenities of the inhabitants of no. 12, contrary to policies DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and London Plan Policy D6.