



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/3068
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	37 Mount Pleasant Villas, Hornsey, London, N4 4HA
Proposal:	Construction of a single storey rear extension at ground floor level and a rear roof dormer extension and front & rear roof lights.
Case Officer:	Eunice Huang
Valid Date:	28/11/2023
Applicant:	Mr Robert Sutton
Agent:	Mr Neil Rigden

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

1.1 The following response was received following consultation on the application:

1) LBH Conservation: 37 Mount Pleasant Villas within the Stroud Green Conservation Area. No objection to the scale of the proposed extension and dormer. It would be preferable if timber cladding was not used, as it is an incongruous material in the area which can be of varying quality. The dormer material should be of a suitably matt finished metal, in a similar colour to the existing, to reduce the dominance of the dormer.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of letters, site notice and press advert. No representations were received.

3. REASONS FOR GRANTING PERMISSION

3.1 The proposal is for construction of a single storey rear extension at ground floor level and a rear roof dormer extension and front & rear roof lights.

3.2 The application site is occupied by a three storey, mid-terrace dwelling house, situated on the western side of Mount Pleasant Villas. The setting is residential in character, within the Stroud Green Conservation Area.

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

- HGY/2021/1936 - Replacement of existing single glazed windows for new double glazed windows to match existing at first and second floor front elevation. – Approved with conditions 16/08/2021.

3.4 The proposed rear extension replaces the existing rear extension. Similar to the existing rear extension, it would be constructed to the northern side boundary. The extension would have a depth of 5.675m and a width of 4.48m. The proposed rear façade would align with that of the existing rear extension, albeit with a box bay window. The proposal also extends into the existing southern side passageway, but retains a 1m setback from the southern boundary. The rear extension has flat roof with a height of 3.15m above existing ground level, which is lower than the height of the existing rear extension.

3.5 The extension would be timber clad. LBH Conservation has recommended that an alternative material is sought to complement the surrounding area. The agent has advised that their client's intention is to select Kebony timber cladding; arguing that it is a high quality product which is treated through a process to preserve the material over time. The timber cladding is considered acceptable in that it would complement the garden setting of rear extension. There are also timber finishes present in the surrounding development, in the boundary structures, sash windows and outbuildings. Furthermore, the proposed ground floor extension would not be apparent from the public domain.

3.6 The proposed design, scale, footprint and siting of the single storey rear extension is considered subservient in relation to the host building rear garden. The size and scale of the extension maintains the legibility of the host building features. The bulk and scale is also compatible with the surrounding terraces, which do not demonstrate a consistent rear façade alignment pattern. The proposal would not dominate the application site or neighbouring properties.

3.7 A rear dormer is proposed to replace the existing dormer. The proposed dormer has a width of 3.48m. It is sited adjacent to the southern side boundary, and set in by 2m from the northern side boundary. The bulk and scale of the dormer is considered satisfactory and subservient to the roof of the host building. This is aided by the materiality – lead material is selected in a colour similar to the existing roof colour, which reduces the prominence of the dormer.

3.8 The proposed rear extension would not appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties and would not result in any significant increase in overshadowing, overlooking or loss of outlook to neighbouring properties. The rear extension has a lower height than the existing extension, and does not extend beyond the existing rear façade, except of the bay window. It would not have a material impact upon the north-adjointing property at No. 45 which also has a rear extension constructed against this common boundary. The extension is setback 1m from the common boundary of No. 43 to the south, with side windows on the southern elevation. However, there are existing windows on this side elevation and the new ground floor windows would not have a material impact upon privacy.

3.9 The rear dormer addition would not appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties. The dormer is set into the main roof form of the terrace, where there is separation distance from outrigger and rear extension windows, and the rear garden, mitigating amenity impacts. The dormer is sited on the southern side of the roof plane. Shadows cast by the dormer would therefore predominantly fall upon the host building and application site. In relation to privacy impact, there is an existing degree of overlooking and cross-viewing available from existing windows and dormers of the subject site and neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore would not have a material adverse overlooking impact in this context.

Conclusion

3.10 The proposed development is in general accordance with Policies DM1, DM9 & DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, Policies SP11 & SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also accords with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

3.12 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above.

4. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions.

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 as specified on the approved plans and documents.

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 SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and 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.