



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/2356
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	67 Talbot Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4QX
Proposal:	Construction of single storey side and rear extension; demolition of existing conservatory; and proposed rear dormer (amended plans and description).
Case Officer:	Nathan Keyte
Valid Date:	23/08/2024
Applicant:	Clare Milner
Agent:	Rita Farrell

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE AND SURROUNDING

The subject property relates to No 67 Talbot Road located on the northern side of road and is a two-storey semi-detached building with two storey rear outrigger and single storey rear conservatory, in use as a single household. The building is located within the of Highgate Conservation Area. Talbot Road is a very long residential street that runs between The Park and Archway Road with the houses largely of the late Victorian period.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

As amended the application is proposing the following works:

- a single storey side and rear extension following demolition of an existing conservatory; and
- proposed rear dormer.

The proposed side extension will be single storey, with its front setback 2.3m from the front of the building, with the façade finished in painted timber. The side extension connects into the proposed single storey rear extension, which infills the space between the existing rear outrigger and the adjoining boundary to the west at no. 69 Talbot Road. The height along the side boundary will be approximately 2.6m for a length of 10.0m, with parapets of approximately 0.4m in height.

Note that the proposal has been revised since the original submission to remove changes proposed to the rear outrigger, with changes to the side/ rear extension design.

3. SITE HISTORY

HGY/1999/0472 - The erection of a rear extension (Certificate of Lawfulness) - Decision: Approve 25/05/1999

4. CONSULTATION

Highgate Neighbourhood Forum – No comment received.

Highgate Society – comments summarised:

- Object to the side extension as the proposal is not subordinate to the existing building, view to be contrary to policy DH4. [Officer comment: addressed in assessment below].
- Object to changing the pitched roof to a flat roof would fail to retain or enhance the existing roof design, view to be contrary to policy DH5. [Officer comment: changes to the rear outrigger have since been removed from the proposal].

Highgate CAAC – comments summarised:

- Objects to new extension as not considered subordinate to existing building and appears substantially higher than the existing shed. [Officer comment: addressed in assessment below].
- Change to the rear outrigger is considered to be an alteration to the roof profile and may have an adverse impact on the amenity of the area, as well as reduce light to neighbouring properties. [Officer comment: changes to the rear outrigger have since been removed from the proposal].
- Overlooking introduced by new sash windows to side elevations and triple sash dormer. [Officer comment: changes to introduce new side windows into the rear outrigger have since been removed from the proposal].

[Officer comment: the application has since been amended to increase the setback of the side extension from the front elevation from 1.2m to 2.3m. Other matters are addressed in the assessment below].

Haringey Conservation Officer – comments summarised:

If a side extension here is to be acceptable, it needs to not inhibit the appreciation of the original pattern of development and urban grain.

It is recommended that the setback for the front elevation is increased to at the least the same level of the existing timber shed. The design and form of the extension also needs to be revised so it is a high quality and distinct but discreet addition. A brick felt flat roof addition is unlikely to be considered acceptable.

Regarding the roof alterations, the rear is less sensitive to change as unfortunately several of the existing outriggers have lost their cat-slide roof form. The proposed raising of the roof would alter the original roof form of the outrigger but in the context of the previous alterations to the rear elevation of this group this is considered to have a negligible impact on the significance of the conservation area.

[Officer comment: the design has since been revised to increase the setback of the side extension from the front of the building and change the design of the front façade to be timber and of a door/ design that emphasises it being separate to the host building. The changes to the rear outrigger have also been removed from the proposal.]

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by the way of letters and a site notice. The following representations in addition to those referenced above were received:

Objections: 3 (three total objections, all from the same party).

Support: 0

Objections material to planning:

- Change in roof form of the rear outrigger will be overbearing and impact light levels. [Officer comment: changes to the rear outrigger have since been removed from the proposal].
- Health concerns from any building works. [Officer comment: Construction works must be carried out in accordance with other legislation separate to planning that cover noise and disturbance, including the Environmental Health Act 1990.]
- Impact on amenity from the boundary works where this extends beyond the corner of the original house, or within footprint of the existing conservatory.
- Impact on amenity from overlooking. [Officer comment: changes to the rear outrigger have since been removed from the proposal].

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and heritage;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and heritage

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation, and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be considered. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, to be sensitive to context.

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. DPD Policy D9 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

Paragraph 12.3.7 of the Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan provides a guide for side extensions, with these where one storey to be at least 1m setback from the front of

the building and no more than half the width of the main building's frontage. In the case of an extension more than one storey high, a minimum gap of 1.5m should be maintained from the side boundary. Materials and detailing should match the main building, however, to appear visually subordinate.

Paragraph 12.3.13 of the Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan provides a guide as it relates to roof form and extensions within the conservation area. Extensions to the front of properties are generally unsuitable. Where side and rear roof extensions and loft conversions are acceptable, the extensions should:

- Compliment the roof form and materials of the host building.
- Hip to gable ends are noted as unacceptable.
- Dormers to the side and rear are noted as potentially acceptable in many cases, provided are subordinate in scale and suitably set in from eaves, ridges and side of the roof of the host building.
- Juliet balconies and roof terraces noted as only acceptable where they are characteristic of the area and do not harm the overall appearance of the host building.
- Roof lights should be conservation type, sitting flush with the slope of the roof.

Policies DH3-DH4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan are also relevant, and touch upon similar points mentioned above. Gaps are to be maintained between buildings where these contribute to the character of the area.

The proposal for a rear dormer to sit on the main rear roof slope. The rear dormer is very modest in size sitting up from the eaves, down from the ridge and well in from the party wall. As such this is considered to be a subservient addition. Other examples of similar sized dormers are noted within the terrace and as such the introduction of such a feature will not be out of character with the area.

In terms of the proposed side/ rear extension, the design, front building line and materiality has changed. Specifically, the front will now be in painted timber. Considering the existence of a side shed, this is considered to be an acceptable material choice. The presence of the side shed is a point of difference between the host building and others within the terrace. The use of materials combined with the greater setback from the front of the building ensure that this is a subordinate addition.

The gap between the buildings above ground floor level will be maintained. The front façade of the side extension will have a height of approximately 2.8m from the ground level, falling to 2.5m/2.6m for the majority of its length. The ground level is lower at the location of the side extension than the host building, further contributing to the subordination of the extension.

The extensions/ alterations are considered acceptable having minimal impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, as such leaving it preserved. In reaching this decision considerable importance and weight has been given to preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area, in line with the statutory test.

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 residents.

The proposed rear dormer by way of very modest size does not raise any issue in terms of amenity. Equally taking account of the existing extent of mutual degrees of overlooking from upper floor windows a dormer here is not viewed to affect amenity.

In terms of impact of the proposed development on no. 65 Talbot Road, the property will not be impacted by the side/ rear extension given its position in relation to the proposed development.

The objections received raise concerns with the proposal and its resulting impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property at No. 69. The objections have included plans and imagery that are helpful in understanding the nature of the impacts, noting these were provided at a time when changes to the rear outrigger were proposed.

As per representation received the position of windows and what they serve are clearly shown. Specifically, the windows in question are a rear facing kitchen window, a side facing window serving a utility room and two side windows serving a bathroom at first floor level. In the case here it is noted that two of the rooms are not habitable rooms with one window (kitchen window) serving a habitable room.

In terms of impact on the rear facing window serving the kitchen window at no. 69 it is noted the side/ rear extension, this will extend along the shared boundary with No. 69 for approximately 10m, with an average height of 2.6m. The occupiers of No 69 point out that the extension will extend beyond the existing footprint of the conservatory but equally it is noted this will not project beyond the rear building line of the outrigger.

It is accepted such an extension will project beyond a 45 degree angle drawn in plan from the centre of the kitchen window, however not infringe the 45 degree line in elevation. Furthermore, given such an extension would sit in shadow/ backdrop of the existing outrigger as well as the modest height of such an extension, breaching this 45 degree angle test in plan view is not significant.

In terms of understanding light, it is also important to bear in mind that daylight is dependent on how much clear sky is visible from a particular window/ specific reference. The visible surface of the extension will not lead to any significant amount of visible sky lost as seen from the neighbouring window. The proposed extension would not breach the tests set out in BRE "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice" (2nd Edition, Littlefair, 2011), known as "The BRE Guide".

Regarding a sense of enclosure or dominance, considering the height of the side/ rear extension will be single storey and project 3.4m, combined with the setback of the property at no. 69 from the shared boundary, this is not considered sufficient to refuse the application.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable subject to conditions. 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.

6. CIL APPLICABLE

While multiple applications are noted as currently proposed for the subject site, the cumulative increase in internal floor area should all be approved does not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 4 Prior to the start of above ground works hereby approved, a schedule of all the proposed external finishes and materials, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved materials and details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development and to ensure the character of the Conservation Area is preserved, consistent with Policies SP11 & SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD (2017).

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.