



07 March 2024

Ref 2220.2- D

London Borough Haringey Council
Development and Renewal
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
N22 8HQ

Dear Sir / Madam

PROPOSED: Works to an Existing Private Residence.

LOCATION: Flat D, 31 Woodland Gardens, N10 3UE.

Please find below the design statement and attached submission of a Householder Application for Planning Permission for Works to a dwelling at Flat D, 31 Woodland Gardens, N10 3UE.

The intention is to undertake the following:

- New external amenity space to existing outrigger extension, set back from sight lines.

This is a second planning app on the same site for a similar design, refer previous app HGY/2023/2566.

The following documents are supplied as part of this application:

P-2220.2-D-000 Existing and Proposed Site Location Plan 1:1250, Site Block Plan 1:250 at A3

P-2220.2-D-004 Existing Upper Ground Floor and First Floor Plan, 1:100 at A3

P-2220.2-D-005 Existing Second Floor Plan, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-006 Existing Roof Plan, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-007 Existing Front Elevation, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-008 Existing Rear Elevation, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-009 Existing Section A-A, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-010 Existing Section B-B, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-104 Proposed Upper Ground Floor & First Floor Plan, 1:100 at A3

P-2220.2-D-105 Proposed Second Floor Plan, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-106 Proposed Roof Plan, 1:50 at A3

P-2220.2-D-107 Proposed Front Elevation, 1:50 at A3
P-2220.2-D-108 Proposed Rear Elevation, 1:50 at A3
P-2220.2-D-109 Proposed Section A-A, 1:50 at A3
P-2220.2-D-110 Proposed Section B-B, 1:50 at A3
P-2220.-D -CIL questions

Please note that the floor levels are defined as follows: Lower Ground Floor (with access to the rear garden), Upper Ground Floor (with access off the street), First Floor, Second Floor (loft level or loft conversion level).

We have studied planning policy and precedent and draw your attention to the following 10 points:

1. Roof terraces are common on the street generally. They are more common at first floor level, however, the following approved examples are at second floor: No 39 and No 17 Woodland Gardens set within the main roof slope setting a precedent for second floor terraces. There is also a second floor, full outrigger roof terrace example at no. 38 Woodland Rise.
2. It is worth noting that the street is on a steep slope and the properties step down in relation to each other so there is a closer than usual connection between the first floor of one property and the second floor of the next.
3. There is not much demand for second floor terraces on the street as the vast majority of properties are single family dwellings with larger terraces at lower levels and good sized gardens. The applicant site however, is a first and second floor flat and the health and wellbeing benefits that a modest external amenity area would bring (to a flat that does not currently have that) would vastly improve the living conditions for the occupants.
4. We wish to point out that the living accommodation / bedrooms that exists at first floor also exist at second floor so therefore we see no reason why a terrace, that can be permitted at first floor level, can not be permitted at second floor level.
5. We have designed the roof terrace so it is modestly sized and accessed off a bedroom (rather than a living room or kitchen) which promotes its use as a low-use external space.
6. The rear elevation of the terrace as a whole is very much established as diversely used and diversely expressed architecturally. There are a variety of recent interventions, with very little consistency and repetition.
7. We fully appreciate the requirement for privacy particularly from a terrace back into the rooms of adjoining properties.
8. We fully appreciate the requirements for the terrace to have low visibility from neighbouring gardens.
9. We do not wish to overdevelop the applicant flat itself or the host building and therefore are proposing the lower end of recommended external area for flats in London. We have also considered the materials that could be used and the plan form utilised to prevent the new addition being visually overdeveloped.
10. Precedent is already firmly set on the street in terms of noise level expectation as there are several terraces and Juliet balconies at bedroom levels.

As stated earlier, this is the second planning app on the same site for a similar design, refer previous app HGY/2023/2566. We have studied the officer report from the previous application (extracts below) and made changes to the proposals in this new application.

With regard to the 'Design and Appearance' the previous application officer report stated the following:

"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.

The proposed roof terrace by reason of its V-shaped design, and its siting whereby it is positioned above a three-storey rear projection, would not complement the form of the existing building. It would appear obtrusive and incongruous, out-of-keeping with the character of the development in the surrounding area as it does not respond to the existing character of the area whereby the roof terraces are positioned above two-storey rear projections, and therefore it is considered to be unacceptable".

We have redesigned the plan shape of the balcony to deal with issue regarding its "V shape design and siting" raised in the previous app as follows:

- We have removed the V shape and made the glass balustrade straight / parallel to the rear edge of the outrigger.
- The terrace now occupies less than 50% of the roof terrace area and is therefore further subservient to the outrigger volume.
- It is set considerably back from the rear edge of the outrigger – approx. 1.5m and therefore has even less visibility or no visibility from the surrounding gardens. Note it is not visible from the public domain.
- As it is a glass balustrade it has a very low visual impact compared to the solid brick, metal and timber guarding of other terraces on the street.
- The floor and roof level changes as the streets descends on the hill disrupts the visual clarity of what is a two-storey and what is a three-storey outrigger.

With regard to the 'Impact on Neighbouring Amenity' the previous app officer report stated the following:

"The proposed drawings show that the privacy angle from the neighbouring windows at nos.29 and 33 would not be impacted, and so it is not considered to overlook the neighbouring windows of the adjoining properties"

The redesign improves privacy even further.

With these changes we believe that the new proposals would not appear an obtrusive and incongruous form of development, or be out of keeping with the general pattern of development and character of the area. We believe we now meet the guidance set out in policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and policies DM1 & DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021.

We consider the proposals not to be an overdevelopment as it is 5 sqm on plan. Within London, each 1-bed, 2-person self-contained private unit must provide 5 sqm of amenity space, with an additional 1 sqm per additional resident, so the proposal is very modestly sized for the applicant flat in this context.

The benefits the terrace will bring to the occupants of the flat in terms of quality of life make this a good quality development rather than an overdevelopment.

We requested that these proposals be recommended for planning approval.

Please contact the writer with any queries.

Regards

Declan Fallon

Fallon Architects
Tobacco Dock
London
E1W 2SF
07920181490
declan@fallon-architects.com
www.fallon-architects.com