

OCC, Building
A, 105 Eade
Road, London
N4 1TJ

Email: info@eadeplanning.com
Office: 020 8150 1820
Mobile: 07815 794 958

Design and Access Statement (revised)

For the

“Erection of first floor rear extensions at No. 35, 37 & 39”

Land at

**35-39 Clifton Gardens,
London N15 6AP**

By Shulem Posen

Eade Planning Ltd

November 2023

Table of Contents

The Site	Page 2
Introduction	Page 2
The Appeal Proposal	Page 3
The Current Proposal	Page 4
Plans	Page 5
Conclusion	Page 5

The Site

1. The subject site consists of two adjoining terraced dwellings located on Clifton Gardens. Both existing buildings are three storeys in height. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.
2. The site has a PTAL rating of 3, meaning it has ‘moderate’ overall transport connectivity and is within 7 minutes walk to the nearest train station and bus routes. There are no trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders within or adjacent to the site. There are no listed buildings within or adjacent to the site and the site is not within a Conservation Area. The closest listed building to the site is the Church of St Bartholomew Grade II* listed approximately 200 metres to the south west. The site is located within the area where Haringey’s “House Extensions in South Tottenham (2013)” SPD applies.

Introduction

3. This application follows a planning permission granted 28 January 2021 under planning ref: HGY/2020/3131 for the Demolition of 37 and 39 Clifton Gardens and the construction of two replacement dwellings comprising a basement, ground, first and second floor with further accommodation in the roof, forming two six-bedroom four-storey family houses.
4. Application ref: HGY/2020/3131 was varied on 19 November 2021 under planning ref: HGY/2021/2863.
5. The development has been mostly built out; however, the first-floor rear extension has not been built in accordance with the approved plans. This application seeks planning permission for a revised first floor extension and also includes a first-floor extension at first floor level at No.35.

6. In fact, an application for the erection of first floor rear extensions at No. 35, 37 and 39 Clifton Gardens was submitted. The application reference is HGY/2022/1546 and is dated 26 May 2022. The application was not determined within the described period and the application was considered by way of an appeal (APP/Y5420/W/22/3304881) following a non-determination appeal being made.
7. The Inspector dismissed the appeal. The proposal has been revised with a view to address the Inspector's concerns. Given that this application seeks to address the concerns raised by the Inspector, this statement will explain how the concerns had been addressed by the revised proposal.
8. The concerns raised by the Inspector relate solely to the first-floor rear extensions. therefore, it is only necessary to address the proposed first floor extension across the three properties.

The Appeal Proposal

9. The proposal (HGY/2022/1546) the subject of the appeal included a first-floor extension across all three properties. the proposed first floor extension was stepped in from the flank wall of No.39 by no more than one metre. It extended the full width of No.37, and half of No.35.
- 10.The application (HGY/2022/1546) relied on planning ref: HGY/2022/0338 which on 30 March 2022 granted planning permission for the Erection of ground floor extensions at No's 5 & 7; first-floor rear extensions at No's 5-11; and Type 3 roof extensions at No's 5, 7 & 11.
- 11.The Inspector considered the proposal as follows,
 - 16.*The extension at No. 39 would span much of the property, with minimal set back from the eastern elevation, while that at No. 37 would run along the entire width of the dwelling. The proposed extension at No. 35 would have a generous set back from the western elevation and, taken on its own, would have a modest width in the context of the host dwelling. However, it would have no separation from the proposed extensions at Nos. 37 – 39, combining to create the visual effect of one large element of projecting built form at the first floor level of these properties.*
 - 17.*Accordingly, the combined visual effect would be unduly dominant in context. Taken together, the extensions would introduce significant additional bulk that would read as overwhelming on the rear facades of the dwellings. The lack of separation between the*

extensions would also disrupt the pleasing symmetry and defining uniformity in appearance at Nos. 37-39, as well as creating an imbalance along the rear of No. 35. As such, the character of these dwellings would not be respected.

18. In this regard, the proposals would also be distinguished from the aforementioned approved schemes² in Clifton Gardens, which retain an overall balanced and coherent form and design at the host dwellings. On the site-specific circumstances of the appeal before me, the proposed first floor rear extensions at the site would read as awkward, dominant and out of place additions, causing visual harm.

19. At paragraph 9 the Inspector further distinguished the proposal from that approved at 5-11 Clifton gardens

9. The appellant has referred to planning permissions granted in Clifton Gardens for first floor rear extensions. However, on the basis of submitted information, these have a more generous set back from outer side boundaries so as to not appear unduly dominant. In addition, the approved development at Nos 5 – 11 incorporates a hipped roof hat, rather than adding to its massing, serves to reducing its visual impact when compared with the flat roof of the proposal.

9. The concerns raised can be summarised as follows,

- Lack of sufficient set back from the boundary, as opposed to a hipped roof proposed at No's 5-11.
- The massing and visual impact of the flat roof, as opposed to a hipped roof proposed at No's 5-11.
- Lack of separation between the extensions, i.e. the extension appear as one.

The Current Proposal

10. The current proposal seeks to replicate the proposal approved at 5-11 Clifton Gardens. It includes a sufficient set back at both, no.35 and No.39; it includes a hipped roof, and shows a separation between the extensions.

11. It is also important to note that planning permission was granted 04 August 2022 under planning ref: HGY/2022/1683 for the Extension to existing ground floor extension at No.12; first-floor rear extensions at No's 12-16; and Type 3 roof extensions at No.12.

12.It is clear that the revisions to the proposal have addressed the concerns raised by the Inspector.

Plans

13.Given that the development is in the process of being developed, the application includes three sets of plans. These are as follows,

- (for information only) Pre-Existing (these the 'existing' plans included in planning ref:HGY/2020/3131.
- Existing plans (these would be as-currently built),
- Proposed (as per the proposal).

Conclusion

14.The development provides for much needed additional residential unit, has policy support at National, London and Local level and therefore, the council are asked to grant permission on the presumption in favour of sustainable housing development.