

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2722
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	5 Waltheof Avenue, Tottenham, London, N17 7PL
Proposal:	Erection of first floor rear extension.
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	10/10/2023
	3
Applicant:	Ms and Mr Rahman and Hussain
Agent:	Mrs K Cowan

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Proposed development

This is an application for a first-floor rear extension above the existing ground floor rear extension with a flat roof. The extension would provide 1no. additional bedroom and extend the existing WC to create a shower room.

The extension would be the same width as the ground floor rear extension and would be 2.28m in depth. It would be set back from the rear wall the ground floor extension by 0.85m. This difference would be covered with a monopitched roof.

The proposed roof would be dual pitched and would be lower than the outrigger monopitched roof by 0.63m. The gradient of the proposed roof slopes would match the existing slopes of the main roof and outrigger roof.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey mid-terrace dwellinghouse with bay window on both the ground and first-floor, a two-storey rear outrigger with a hipped roof, and an existing rear extension. The site is within the Tower Gardens Conservation Area. Lordship Recreation Ground located to the south of the site on Lordship Lane via Waltheof Avenue.

There is an example of a two-storey rear extension from the existing outrigger, at No.13 under OLD/1987/2012, which has been built. However, this was built at a time before the existing local plan was adopted, as well as preceding local plans.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

HGY/2023/0785 | REF 06/6/2023 Erection of a first floor rear extension above the existing ground floor rear extension.

HGY/2023/0784 | REF 18/7/2023 Construction of a loft extension with a rear dormer with timber sash windows.

OLD/1984/1694 | WTD 3/4/84 Construction of front porch, installation of new door, formation of separate garden from adjacent house and pebble dusk front elevation.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 7 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

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
2. Standard and quality of residential accommodation; and
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The site is in Character Sub Area A of the Tower Gardens conservation area, which is a pre-WW1 cottage estate area. Both the east and west side of Waltheof Avenue were built around 1906-7. The area is recognised for the high degree of visual uniformity and visual coherence the two and three storey terrace rows display. The character and appearance of this conservation area has generally been maintained although it is acknowledged that one or two properties in the conservation area have had work done to the roof. Paragraph 3.4.6 of the appraisal states that rear extensions should usually be one storey and should generally extend no more than 3m beyond the rear wall in terraced properties.

The Conservation Officer referred to paragraphs 3.4.1 to 3.4.2, which states that in some cases it will be possible to extend houses in Tower Gardens without damage to the building's character, subject to sensitive handling of scale and detail. However, where extensions would detract from the uniformity of a group of buildings or have a negative impact on views or the street scene, they will be unacceptable in principle. Extensions will only be permitted if subordinate in size and appearance to the original building. Care should be taken that the form and proportions of the original building are not obscured.

The conservation officer concluded that the proposed extension is at first floor level. There is a similar example further down the terrace of a similar size. While the proposed extension would somewhat distort the form of the existing outrigger, it does not appear overly overbearing or dominant and would not be visible from any of the surrounding streets. On this basis the extension as proposed would likely have a neutral impact on the significance of the conservation area. Provided the materials are exactly matching the existing (see recommended condition below) there would not be a conservation objection to the proposed works.

As mentioned above, there is another example of a two-storey rear extension at No.13 from the outrigger, however this was built at a time before the existing local plan was adopted, as well as preceding local plans. Also, it does not appear to complement the outrigger because of the flat roof being adjacent to the hipped roof and is at odds with the proportions and character of this terrace.

Following the refused application, this proposal has made a few amendments. These include the rear wall of the extension being set back from the rear wall of the ground floor extension by 0.8m. This setback would be covered with a monopitched roof above the edge, which would have regard to the appearance and character for the host property. Instead of flat roof, a dual pitched roof would be provided over the proposed extension, which would be lower than the existing outrigger roof by 0.6m and therefore lower than the ridge.

The conservation area appraisal guide states that rear extensions should be one storey and no more than 3m in depth. In this case, a second storey is being added but the depth would be 2.23m, which does not exceed the maximum requirement. The design of the proposal meets the requirements of paragraphs 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 of the appraisal guide, because care has been taken to consider the features of the host building with the addition of the dual pitched roof above the extension, and the monopitched roof above the setback. However, it is advised that that rear extensions should only be one storey, and the approved planning permission under ref. OLD/1987/2012 is not considered as precedent.

Overall, improvements have been made to the size and appearance of the first floor extension, by reducing its mass and bulk. However, the siting of extension here would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing property, the uniformity and appearance of this original terrace and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Tower Gardens Conservation Area.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to be of high quality design, providing comfortable and functional layouts, benefiting from sufficient daylight and sunlight, maximising the provision of dual aspect units and providing adequate and easily accessible storage space as well as outdoor amenity space. Table 3.1 sets out the internal minimum space standards for new developments, while Table 3.2 of the London Plan provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments.

The proposed extension would create a third bedroom that would be 2.2m in width and 3.3m in depth. It exceeds the minimum requirements for one bedspace single bedroom, and so it complies with the minimum space standards for one bedspace bedroom. The extension would also provide space for the WC and shower room on the first floor, which would improve the living standards for the occupants by providing a washroom next the bedrooms instead of just having the one WC on the ground floor next to the kitchen.

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.

Upon review of the previous application, it is considered that the extension would lead to a loss of light to the rear neighbouring window at no.7. Considering that the properties are most likely mirror each other in layout regardless of the extensions, the room in the rear of the first floor of the outrigger could potentially be box room that of the same measurements as the site, which exceed the minimum requirements for a one bedspace room. Therefore, the extension would potentially lead to overshadowing the neighbouring window, which would serve a habitable room. Therefore, as mentioned in the previous application, the existing outrigger (as do outriggers in general) restrict conditions of light. By virtue of the position of No 7 due north, the introduction of such an extension would lead to undue overshadowing and a loss of light to the rear of this property.

The proposal is therefore not considered to be acceptable in amenity terms.

Conclusion

In summary, improvement have been made to the size and appearance of the first floor extension, by reducing its mass and bulk. However, the siting of extension here would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing property, the uniformity and appearance of this original terrace and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Tower Gardens Conservation Area. Equally, such an extension would be harmful to the amenity of No 7 Waltheof Road, specifically leading to overshadowing and loss of light.

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

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed first-floor extension, by reason of its size and location, would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing property, the uniformity and appearance of this original terrace and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Tower Gardens Conservation Area, contrary to London Plan (2021) Policy HC1, policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed first-floor extension, by reason of its height, siting and orientation in relation to No 7 Waltheof Road would result in undue overshadowing and a loss of sunlight to the rear of this property, resulting in undue harm to the neighbouring amenity, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

Informatives:

In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our pre-application advice service and published development plan, comprising the London Plan 2021, the Haringey Local Plan 2017 along with the Tower Garden Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.