



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0924
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	38 Lordsmead Road, Tottenham, London, N17 6EY
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear infill extension.
Case Officer:	Emily Whittredge
Valid Date:	03/04/2024
	4
Applicant:	Mr. Asif Hussain
Agent:	Other TRICON DESIGN

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

The application seeks permission for a side infill extension to an original two storey outrigger, to extend a single dwellinghouse.

The property has previously been extended to the rear of the outrigger with a full-width addition, leaving a 1.8m x 5.25m lightwell to the side of the property, onto which looks the dining room's bay window and the rear reception room. The proposed extension would infill the existing lightwell, and combined with the existing rear extension would result in a wrap-around addition 10.15m long and 3m tall.

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a mid-terrace dwelling located on the west side of Lordsmead Road. The site is not located in a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

No planning or enforcement history.

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of letters to neighbouring occupants. One representation was received from the applicant in support of the application.

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance;
2. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Design & 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 and 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. All new housing and residential extensions must be of a high quality, taking account of the privacy and amenity of neighbouring uses (see Policy DM1) and are required to meet or exceed the minimum internal and external space standards of the London Plan and the Mayor's Housing SPG.

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 infill would result in the omission of the existing light well and infilling of windows that serve the rear reception and dining rooms. In combination with the existing full width rear extension, the proposal would create two deep (8m) rooms at ground floor level, having less light and outlook than the existing. While this does not reflect the aims of the London Plan and the Mayor's Housing SPG, on balance, this reason would not sustain a refusal of the proposal.

The proposal represents a minor addition to the property that, in context with the existing full width extension, would not have a significant impact on the appearance of the host building and the wider area. Sufficient garden area would be retained. The proposal is therefore acceptable with regards to design and appearance.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

London Plan 2021 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.

Development Management DPD 2017 Policy DM1 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.

In relation to No. 36, the extension would be situated on the shared boundary and project a depth of 10.15m long and 3m tall. The development would adjoin the side return of No. 36, which is 1.8m wide, and even narrower where it adjoins their bay window. The height and length of the resulting development is considered excessive and would create a tunnelling effect, given the neighbouring property does not have any such extension. Because of the narrow width of the side returns to these properties, the flank wall of the extension would sit extremely close to the rear and side ground floor windows to this property and have a significant adverse effect on their residential amenity.

Conditions of light and outlook are already constrained by the two-storey outriggers, but by virtue of such a side extension in terms of its length, width and height, would render this impact more acute. The sense of enclosure caused by the development would be significantly greater than the existing outrigger and boundary fence. For the reasons above, the proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of its impact on the amenity of neighbours.

Conclusion

The proposed infill extension, by reason of its siting and height, in combination with the proximity and length of the existing rear extension, would cause unacceptable harm in terms of loss of outlook and light and increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No. 36.

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

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed infill extension, by reason of its siting, length and height would be unacceptably harmful in terms of loss of outlook and light, and increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No. 36, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).