

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/2436
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	59, Gladesmore Road, London, N15 6TA
Proposal	Erection of ground floor infill extension together with erection of a type 3 loft
Case Officer	Daniel Kwasi
Valid Date	05/08/2022
Applicant	Sacha Stern
Agent	Mr Jeremiah Ayerh

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is an application for the erection of a ground floor infill extension together with erection of a type 3 loft extension.

Site and Surroundings

The site is an end of terraced property located on Gladesmore Road. The site is not located within a conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building. Gladesmore Road is within the defined area outlined in LB Haringey's 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' SPD (2013).

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

There is no planning history in relation to the site.

Consultation response

No responses were received following consultation on the application.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 21 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
Objecting: 0
Supporting: 0

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

Principle of development;
Design and appearance;
Impact on neighbouring amenity; and
Other considerations.

Principle of development

The application site is located within the designated area identified in Haringey SPD 'House Extension in South Tottenham' (2013). The SPD provides additional guidance on the design of house extensions being built to meet the need for providing additional habitable accommodation for large families in this part of the borough. The SPD sought to provide clear and consistent guidance on the form of roof extension defining three approved ways in which homes may be approved at roof level.

The SPD states further that *"some of the older homes in the area have large, second floor gabled roofs as existing. Such properties may not be suitable for design type 2 or 3 extensions. However, these houses generally have a higher roof ridge, making type 1 extensions easier to achieve"*. This is in reference to the type of houses shown in Figure 9 of SPD that are not considered to be suitable for type 2 and 3 extensions.

This proposal is for a Type 3 second floor extension in one of the locations deemed not appropriate in the SPD, and so given its location/typology, the principle of this type of extension is not acceptable subject to the design detailing.

While the principle of a type '2' or type '3' roof extensions, are considered unacceptable in this instance, the council appreciates the need for additional floorspace within the wider South Tottenham area and the broad acceptance of additional floors, as set out in the House Extension in South Tottenham SPD to meet this need. As such officers did suggest an alternative approach to create a mansard roof extension behind the front gable. While this was considered by the applicant, it was decided to stick with the type '3' application.

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.

During the planning process it was discovered that this property cannot benefit from a type 3 roof extension based on the guidance in the SPD. Although another property of the same character at no. 45 received planning permission under application ref: HGY/2022/0390, this was approved by error and is considered to be an anomaly. The council worked closely with the agent to revise the drawings which produced an alternative mansard roof extension set behind the front gable, which was considered to maintain the front gable appearance of the street, which would be a slight modification of the front and rear dormer on the adjoining property, No. 57. However, the applicant stated that they would revert back to proposing a type 3, which deviates from the guidance in the

SPD, for which they have been made aware of. Therefore, the original proposal is not considered to be acceptable.

As mentioned above, the council did suggest an alternative solution which would allow for an additional floor while maintaining the uniform third floor front gable of this row of properties, as this was not considered acceptable. Officers consider that this was a reasonable compromise to retain the attractive front gable of this row of properties, however the type '3' could not be supported for the reasons set out above.

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.

Under sub-heading 'Rear extensions' of the SPD states that in considering proposals for rear extensions the Council will assess their impact on the adjoining dwellings, with particular attention paid to protecting privacy, maintaining sunlight and daylight, and maintaining a reasonable outlook for adjoining properties.

Based on the original proposal, the additional floor would not have a significant impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties. There would be no significant harm to the amenities of the adjacent occupiers, as the proposal extends upwards only and within the existing footprint of the host building.

The infill extension at 2.99m high and 4.1m in depth would typically be considered excessive if immediately adjoining another property in the terrace, however as this is the end of terrace property, adjoining a rear garden, it is considered that there would be no significant amenity impact.

Other considerations

Under sub-heading 'Structure' of the 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. There have been additional alterations in the form of a single storey rear infill extension to the existing dwelling and the proposed build would be scrutinised by Building Surveyors.

This would not be a standard requirement for planning consideration, but as this is specifically referred to in the adopted SPD it is consider that this should be formally submitted to the Local Authority prior to commencement of development, secured by condition, if the proposal was considered acceptable.

Conclusion

On balance, the proposal would not accord with the aims and objectives of the SPD 'House Extensions in South Tottenham' (2013) with regard to the roof extension type that is being proposed for these types of houses. The infill extension would harm the amenities of the adjoining neighbours and therefore would not be considered acceptable.

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.

CIL APPLICABLE

N/A

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed type '3' roof extension, due to the design and appearance, is not considered to be suitable for this type of property and would introduce a discordant feature to the elevations of this type of building detracting from the visual appearance of the property and is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area by reason paragraph 3.23 and Figure 9 contrary to the guidance in the South Tottenham House Extensions SPD and Policy DM12 of The 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 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.