



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/3346
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	5 Rostrevor Avenue, Tottenham, London, N15 6LA
Proposal:	Erection of first floor rear extension and type 3 extension with the installation of 4 rooflights
Case Officer:	Sabelle Adjagboni
Valid Date:	18/12/2023
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Halpern
Agent:	Shulem Posen

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development.

This is an application for the erection of a first-floor rear extension and a 'Type 3' roof extension to create an additional storey.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling towards the west side of Rostrevor Avenue near its intersection with the High Road. The site is not located within a conservation area, nor does it have a listed building status. Part of Rostrevor Avenue is one of the streets designated in LB Haringey's 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' SPD (2013). The site falls just outside this perimeter.

Consultation response

No responses were received following consultation on the application.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 5 letters to neighbours. The number of representations received is as follows:

Supporting: 0
Objecting: 1

Issues from the objection include:

1. Overshadowing
2. Loss of outlook
3. Breach of party wall agreement with development over the boundary line

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of Development
2. Design and appearance
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity

Principle of Development

The application site is located just outside the boundary of the designated area identified in the Haringey SPD 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' (2013). Although the application site falls outside the designated area, given that many properties have done this type of development, guidance from the SPD is also relevant here. The SPD provides additional guidance on the design of house extensions being built in this part of the borough to provide additional habitable accommodation for large households whilst ensuring that any additions are built to an appropriate scale with attention to promoting good design in terms of materials and detailing.

This application is for a 'Type 3' full 2nd-floor extension with loft accommodation at 3rd-floor level. It is noted that whilst this is one of 3 approved designs for roof extensions within the South Tottenham Area as outlined in the SPD, the application must be considered on its own merits and due regard must be given to the impact this will have upon the appearance of the buildings and the terrace in terms of, inter alia, the proposed detailing and fenestration, as well as any adverse impacts to the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of overshadowing, overlooking et cetera that might arise (see below).

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.

Also, relevant here is design guidance relating to facing materials, fenestration and detailing for 'Type 3' roof extensions as set out in Haringey SPD 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' (2013), as well as general design guidance set out in SPG1a 'Design Guidance'.

'Type 3' extension

A good number of 'type 3' extensions can be seen to have been developed in the area, near the site, including, Nos. 1, 18, 23 and 29; and Nos. 3, 9, 11, 15, 17, 19 and 21 can also be seen to have 'type 2' (front and rear dormers) extension just like the application site. Hence, house extensions of this

nature are quite common on the street. The proposal will have a dual-pitched roof in keeping with the original design.

Given that the proposed 'type 3' addition is a growing feature for properties in the area, it is considered that the proposal would be an acceptable contribution to the process of '... gradual transition' to a terrace with an extended roof level. Furthermore, by complying with one of the 3 approved types of roof extensions the proposal would help to establish a consistency of scale and character for the terrace and eventually the whole area, as described in the 'Broad Design Considerations' (section 3) contained within the 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' SPD (2013).

The proposed plans indicate that the proposed 'type 3' roof extension will be finished in line with the guidance set out in the relevant SPD: the walls at 2nd-floor level will be rendered to match the existing colour and finish, as will the new flank walls at the loft level; new windows at 2nd-floor level will follow the original fenestration pattern and will match existing in terms of detailing and materials; the front bay window will be extended to 2nd-floor level and reproduced exactly; and the roof, including tiling and eaves, will be entirely reproduced using the original roofing materials.

Permitted Development Rights to change the materials and details of windows will be removed. This is to ensure that the appearance of windows in extensions is in accordance with the planning permission SPD para 3.29.

Therefore, the proposed 'Type 3' roof extension is considered to be acceptable on design and appearance grounds.

First-floor extension

The application also proposes a first-floor extension over the existing single-storey rear extension in an outrigger-style design. The extension is about 2.7m deep and features a dual-pitch roof with a maximum height of about 3.68m and an eave height of approximately 2.6m.

This combined with the deep full-width ground floor extension and the type 3 extension will make the site appear overdeveloped in comparison to the adjoining properties and other properties on the street. Even though type 3 extensions can be seen on the street, first-floor extensions are hardly apparent on the street.

Hence, the cumulative impact of the different extensions on this site would be detrimental to the pattern and grain of development in the area and overall represent the overdevelopment of this plot.

As such, the proposal is considered at odds with the above policies.

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 the amenity of neighbouring residents.

'Type 3' extension

A 'Type 3' roof extension involves a significant increase in the height of the roof and the overall bulk and massing of the property. As such applications must be assessed against any likely overshadowing impact affecting the amount of sunlight available to adjoining properties.

The orientation of the properties is west by south facing and the east-west sun path would normally cast a shadow on the northern side of the properties, which would largely fall toward the rear of the property. However, given that the proposal extends upward only and within the existing footprint of the host building, there would be no significant impact on the daylight or sense of enclosure of adjoining occupiers at Nos. 3 and 7. As such this extension is not considered to cause any significantly harmful impact to the amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of loss of light or overshadowing.

As the new windows proposed will either be front or rear facing and at 2nd floor level it is not considered that any additional privacy overlooking will result from the proposed extension.

Whilst it is noted that any additional storey being added to an existing two-storey property may have the effect of giving an overbearing appearance to that property, the proposed 'type 3' extension will only be noticeable from the highway and the rear of the neighbours' garden rather than from any of the adjoining occupiers' windows, and thus, any harm caused is not considered to result in a significant adverse impact.

Considering the above, the proposed 'type 3' roof extension is considered to be acceptable on amenity impact grounds.

First-floor extension

The extension here in itself is not directly viewed to materially harm amenity where:

On the boundary with No.7, the proposed first-floor rear extensions would be set in from the boundary line by over 2.6 metres. Hence, it is considered that the impact on their daylight, sense of enclosure or outlook would be minimal. The concern raised regarding the infringement of the party wall is a civil matter which cannot be resolved with this report. The objector is advised to raise with the council's enforcement team any issues regarding breach of planning.

On the other boundary with No.3, given the eave's height, it is also considered that the impact on their daylight and sense of enclosure would be minimal.

However, the first-floor extension would result in disproportionately large extensions in contrast with the relatively small site and in relation to multiple properties would erode the character of the area and harm the amenity. As such approving such an extension here would make other similar proposals more difficult to resist, demonstrating why it is reasonable to refuse such an application.

As such, the proposal is considered at odds with the above policies.

Additional matters

Paragraph 3.36 of the South Tottenham SPD states that "all proposals for Type 2 and Type 3 provide structural calculations to demonstrate that the additional loading on the ground by the foundations does not exceed the accepted maximum bearing capacity of the ground."

No calculations have been formally submitted to the LPA with this application, however, structural calculations are an integral part of building regulations submission and as such will need to be assessed during the detailed design and construction phases of such a project. As per a condition imposed below steps are required to be taken by a qualified professional to demonstrate that the additional loading on the ground by the foundations does not exceed the accepted maximum bearing capacity of the ground.

It is highlighted that other legislation, the Party Wall Act and Building Regulations etc., also provide further safeguards to identify and control the nature and magnitude of the effect on neighbouring properties. The necessary party-wall agreements with adjoining owners would need to be in place prior to the commencement of works on site. The Party Wall Act 1996 exists separately from the planning system, to reconcile differences that adjoining development might cause.

Conclusion

The overall proposal is not acceptable as it would represent an overdevelopment of this site by virtue of the additional first-floor extension created in conjunction with the extent to which the property has already been extended in comparison with the pattern of development that can be seen on the street.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be granted 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

Registered No. HGY/2023/3346

For the following reasons:

The proposal would represent overdevelopment and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan (2017), and policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

Refusal Reasons:

The proposal would represent overdevelopment and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan (2017), and policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

