

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2061
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Ground Floor Flat, 236 Victoria Road, Wood Green, London, N22 7XQ
Proposal:	Proposed ground floor rear extension and internal alterations to existing ground floor flat.
Case Officer:	Eunice Huang
Valid Date:	20/12/2023
Applicant:	3
Agent:	Mr Mike Kennedy

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

2.1 This application is for proposed ground floor rear extension and internal alterations to existing ground floor flat.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is located on the northern side of Victoria Road, with a rear frontage to Albert Road. The building is not located in a conservation area or within the curtilage of a listed building.

2.3 The application site is irregular in shape comprising a two storey mid-terrace dwelling. The building contains two flats; one on the ground floor, and one on the first floor level. The proposal pertains to the ground floor flat, which has sole access to the rear garden. The land falls towards the rear boundary.

2.4 The existing terrace building has a rear two storey outrigger constructed to the western side boundary. An outbuilding is located in the rear garden, which is used as a home office.

2.5 The site is part of a row of two storey terrace dwellings. The terrace row on the northern side of Victoria Road, from No. 140 to No. 236 characteristically comprises rear outriggers, which generally have a rear alignment similar to the development site. Nos. 238 and 240, which are located immediately to the west of the site, are irregular shaped with shallow lot depths, due to the angle of the junction between Victoria Road and Albert Road.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

2.6 The most recent planning history relating to the site as is as follows:

- HGY/2021/1209 – Build a garden studio that is below 2.5m high and is 5.76m in total floor space of sips panels and shiplap cladding sitting on a concrete base – Approved 08/06/2021

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 No consultation responses were received.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of 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: 2
Support: 0
Object: 2

4.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Height of extension is not proportionate or subordinate to the existing structure
- Footprint out of character with neighbouring properties
- Daylight/sunlight impact
- Overlooking from extension and repositioned outbuilding
- Poor outlook from neighbouring properties
- Boundary planting should not be used as mitigating factor because it can die or be removed at any time.
- Drainage and reduction of permeable surfaces

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

- Design & Appearance; and
- Neighbour Amenity.

Design and appearance

5.2 Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects

local context and character to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to meet a range of criteria having regard to the following: building heights; form, scale and massing prevailing around the site; urban grain; sense of enclosure and where appropriate following existing building lines; rhythm of neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths; active, lively frontages to public realm; and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

5.3 Policy DM12 of the Haringey's Development Management DPD specifies that extensions to residential buildings should be subordinate in scale to the original building, as well as respect the architectural unity of a block or terrace of houses and the urban grain and character of the surrounding area. New development should not undermine existing uniformity of the building or terrace, and should not over balance or dominate existing features important to the building. The policy further elaborates that the depth of rear extension should be such that the resulting footprint is subordinate to the main house and does not have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, ensuring no overlooking or inappropriate loss of daylight and sunlight

5.4 The proposal includes the erection of a rear extension on the ground floor, with a side return, and a flat roof. The proposed extension infills the passageway between the eastern side boundary and the existing outrigger, with an internal courtyard. The rear extension has a length of 3.4m from the existing rear façade, and spans the width of the lot. The height of the extension reaches 4m. The rear extension steps down from the existing ground level in response to the changes in the natural topography. However, the existing ceiling level is maintained, resulting in a 3.7m floor to ceiling height in the rear extension.

5.5 The proposed rear extension would substantially extend beyond the rear alignment of terrace dwellings along the northern side of Victoria Road. The existing outriggers present among No. 140 to No. 236 characteristically generally have a rear alignment similar to the development site. Furthermore, the plots/rear gardens of dwellings at Nos. 238 and 240, to the west, are shallow in depth. The 3.4m deep footprint would not be subservient to the host building or neighbouring terraces.

5.6 The applicant's Planning Statement argues that the height of the extension is subordinate and acceptable due to the land levels of the site and neighbours. The height of the side return is 2.8m, with the height increasing to a maximum of 4m as the ground falls to the rear. The Planning Statement notes "...the ground level in the garden has been partially excavated to eliminate a slope in the land and sits some 1.2m below the floor level of the main building. From the ground level beneath the building itself, the extension rises around 2.8m, not an excessive height."

5.7 It is noted that the rear garden levels had a slope, falling to the rear of the site towards Albert Road. This slope appears to be represented by the dotted line on the section drawing. The photos submitted in the Planning Statement also show that the rear garden has been partially excavated. However, the extent of the excavation depth is unclear in the plans and documentation.

5.8 Due to the pre-existing slope, the existing ground level rises 0.9m above the garden level. The Planning Statement's assertion that the extension rises around 2.8m above the

ground level beneath the existing building is not correct, based on the measurements presented in the section drawing. This drawing shows a 2.8m height measurement from the existing internal finished floor level to the top of the extension. The height measurement would therefore be 3.7m at the existing rear façade of the building.

5.9 The height and massing of the rear extension is expected to respond to the levels, slopes and fall of the ground, as well as the form and design of existing buildings, pursuant to Policy DM1 of Haringey's Development Management DPD. The applicant's Planning Statement argues that a lower height would relate poorly to the existing rear windows. It is noted that the design thus attempts to relate positively to the existing levels of the host building. However, the proposed height in conjunction with the width and depth of the extension, results in a dominant addition that is not subordinate to the host building nor the adjoining properties, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and the wider locality.

Neighbour amenity

5.10 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 residents.

5.11 The proposed bulk and scale of the extension would be apparent from adjoining properties at Nos. 234 and 238. The proposed rear extension rises above the soldier brick course over the existing rear door of the host building. The construction of an additional 3.4m depth expanse of wall on the western boundary would thus have a visually overbearing impact on the occupants of No. 238, which has a shallow plot depth and garden. This neighbouring property also has lower ground levels due to the natural topography of the area. The applicant's Planning Statement emphasises the existing presence of screen planting on the boundary of No. 238 to soften the appearance of the proposal. However, landscape planting cannot be solely relied upon to mitigate the impacts of the proposal, because its health and maintenance cannot be guaranteed and it is subject to seasonal changes.

The proposed extension would result in the ground floor of the host building projecting 7.5 metres beyond the rear extent of no. 238 as shown on the submitted floor plans. Given that the height of the extension would mid-point of the adjacent ground floor rear window of no. 238 by 1.7 metres, this would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook and visually overbearing impact.

5.12 The length of the proposed new wall on the eastern boundary would have a length of 8.082m. It is noted that the ground levels of No. 234 are higher than the application site. However, the level differences would not adequately ameliorate the visual impact of the proposed extension, which would contribute to an enclosing effect on the adjacent ground floor windows of No. 234.

5.13 The application site and adjoining properties are orientated on a north-south axis, with north-facing rear windows and rear gardens. As such, the existing solar access to rear rooms and gardens is restricted by the site orientation. No daylight/sunlight report has been submitted alongside this application to determine the impact of the proposal on neighbouring occupants in terms of access to daylight. However, given the depth of the extension in conjunction with its height and siting on neighbouring boundaries, the development would give rise to *an unacceptable reduction daylight to Nos. 234 and particularly 238. Additional overshadowing would likely impact upon adjoining rear gardens.*

5.14 Objections have been raised against the proposal in respect to privacy and overlooking. The proposed side-facing windows are drawn with sill heights of 1.8m and 3m above finished floor level. The sill heights would mitigate privacy impact on the adjoining property. There were also concerns about overlooking from the new garden outbuilding.

The description of development within the planning application form did not include any works to erect or amend the positioning of a rear outbuilding and no elevations have been submitted of the existing or proposed structure. As such, the outbuilding does not form part of the development subject to assessment in this application. An informative shall be included to this effect, and outline that the applicant would need to apply for full planning application for any alteration to the siting/scale of the outbuilding, as flats do not benefit from permitted development rights to erect such structures.

Conclusion

5.15 The proposed bulk, scale and massing of the development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal does not satisfy Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017, and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017.

5.16 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

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

1. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its excessive bulk, massing and design, would result in a visually over-dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to this property, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and wider locality, contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
2. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its excessive depth, bulk, height and massing, would result in an unacceptable impact on outlook, light and would be visually overbearing in appearance, to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of

neighbouring nos. 234 and 238 Victoria Road, contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

Informatives:

The applicant is advised that the alterations to the positioning/scale of the outbuilding were not included within the description on the submitted planning application form and was not shown on the elevations, and therefore did not form part of the assessment for this planning application. Full planning permission for any alteration to the siting/scale of the outbuilding would be required for a flat.

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 relevant SPD/SPG documents, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.