



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/2825
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	3 Handsworth Road, Tottenham, London, N17 6DB
Proposal:	Erection of single-storey rear extension
Case Officer:	Sabelle Adjagboni
Valid Date:	25/10/2024
	4
Applicant:	Mr Milnes
Agent:	Ms Eleanor Dodman

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development.

This is an application for the erection of a single storey rear extension

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey terraced house located on the southern end of Handsworth Road near its intersection with Philip Lane. It is not in a conservation area nor is it a listed building.

Many houses on the street can be seen to have rear/side extensions including No. 5, the direct neighbour of the application site.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The recent planning history of the site is as follows:

1 - HGY/2024/2826 Non-Material Amendment (NMA) to Planning Permission Ref: HGY/2023/1527 to replace the cladding material for the loft conversion from brick to timber cladding. Granted 19 December 2024

2 - HGY/2023/1527

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear side infill extensions and L-shape loft conversion with rear dormers and new velux windows.

Decision Date: 8 January 2024

Decision: Granted with Conditions

Consultation response

No consultations were carried out for this application.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 9 letters to neighbours. No representations were received.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance &
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity

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.

The proposed single-storey extension consists of a combination of flat and pitched roofs, a rooflight, and rear facing windows/doors for the proposed kitchen area. The extension would extend about 4m beyond the depth of the existing outrigger, creating a courtyard to the side. The flat roof on the boundary with No. 1 will have a height of approximately 3m, sloping down to the pitched roof on the boundary with No. 5 which would have a height around 2.7m.

The proposed boundary heights over a depth of 4m would result in an incongruous and overly large structure at the rear of the property. This would dominate the rear elevation and fail to respect the design and proportions of the host dwelling.

Most properties in the vicinity do not feature ground floor extensions of this depth along their boundaries. Those that do seem to either be constructed under permitted development rights or without planning permission.

While it is noted that the adjacent property No. 5 has a ground floor side and rear extension, its projection beyond the existing outrigger is relatively modest and does not fully wrap around. Furthermore, its eaves height is closely aligned with the existing boundary fence, ensuring it remains subordinate to the original building.

Although the proposed scheme includes a courtyard, the existing shadowing effect on the site raises concerns about its effectiveness in providing adequate daylight to the internal space. Additionally, it should be noted that the application site already has planning permission (HGY/2024/1527) for a side infill extension. The cumulated impact of the approved side infill and proposed rear extension would exacerbate the overbearing nature of the development, leading to the overdevelopment of the site. This would detract from the appearance of the property and have a materially adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Moreover, the proposed use of timber cladding does not match the existing finishes, further emphasizing the discordant nature of the addition.

Overall, the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous and insubordinately large structure, out of keeping with the established form and character of the locality.

As such, the proposal is 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 amenity of neighbouring resident.

Given that No. 5 already has a side and rear infill and that the proposal includes a pitched roof on this side, the impact on the amenities of this neighbour would be minimal.

However, on the boundary with No. 1, the proposed height of approximately 3m over a depth of 4m would result an overbearing structure, creating a significant overshadowing effect on their rear garden. This would adversely affect their ability to enjoy their outdoor space and diminish the daylight they currently receive. Such an impact would be unsympathetic to the neighbouring property, and therefore, unacceptable.

As such, in terms of impact on amenities, the proposal is at odds with the above policies.

Refusal reasons:

1. The proposed extension by virtue of its bulky mass and size, would lead to a built form of an incongruous scale that would detract from the appearance of the original dwelling and have a harmful effect on the appearance, character and pattern of development of the terrace, contrary to Policies SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM1, and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).
2. The proposed extension would be overbearing and have an adverse impact on daylight for the neighbours, contrary to policies D1 of the London Plan and DM1 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be refused 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 subject to conditions

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed extension by virtue of its bulky mass and size, would lead to a built form of an incongruous scale that would detract from the appearance of the original dwelling and have a harmful effect on the appearance, character and pattern of development of the terrace, contrary to Policies SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policy DM1, and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed extension would be overbearing and have an adverse impact on daylight for the neighbours, contrary to policies D1 of the London Plan and DM1 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).