

Appendix 9

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

London Plan (2011)

Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006)

UD3	General Principles
UD4	Quality Design
CSV1	Development in Conservation Areas
CSV5	Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas

Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents

SPG1a	Design Guidance
SPG2	Conservation and Archaeology
SPD	Housing

Local Development Framework Draft Local Plan (Formerly Core Strategy) & Proposals Map

SP2	Housing
SP11	Design
SP12	Conservation

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

The proposed works must be considered from both an amenity and design perspective. Policy UD4 relates to the overall design and scale of the extension in regard to the site and the surrounding area. Policy UD3 and SPD Housing relate to the impact of a development on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the locality generally. SPG1a supports the intent of policy UD4. Section part D.1 states that “the form, rhythm and massing of the buildings should reflect important features in the surrounding buildings” while section F.2 states that “extensions or alterations to buildings should be subordinate in scale to the original building and should respect its architectural character. Thus the alteration or extension should fit in to the character of the house, or if in contrasting design, should by its independence and smallness of scale not undermine the architectural effect of the whole”. Furthermore, the “development should not undermine the existing uniformity of the building or row, and should not overbalance or dominate existing features important to the building”. The conservation area policies, CSV1, CSV5 and SPG2 seek to ensure development preserves and enhances the character of conservation areas.

The application seeks planning permission for the Demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of two storey side extension and erection of single storey rear/side extension. Demolition of garden wall and erection of new garden wall. Taking each element of the proposal in turn:

Demolition of existing side extension and erection of two storey side extension

The property currently has a part single storey part two storey side extension. The single storey element has a flat roof and the side wall of the extension (facing onto Albert Road) has been rendered and painted white. The single storey extension and render both in

terms of design and materials is out of keeping with the character of the building and conservation area. Furthermore, the render has not been maintained and is in a poor state of repair further adding to its detrimental impact.

The proposal is to demolish the single storey side extension and replace it with a two storey extension. The proposed development would be set back from the front elevation and the roof line would match that of the existing two storey side element. Also, the roofline would continue the angle of the main roof but be set below the eaves of the main dwelling. For these reasons the proposed extension would be subordinate to the house, in accordance with UD4 and SPG1a. Original features such as the ornate timber girding will be incorporated into the design of the extension, to match the existing. Also, the existing render would be removed and the new extension constructed out of brick to match the existing. The roof tiles which were originally slate have been replaced with concrete tiles and it is proposed to remove these non original materials which are not sympathetic to the character of the building and do not preserve the character of the conservation area, with Welsh slate. The materials will be controlled via a condition of consent.

Although the Stroud Green CAAC have objected to the proposed first floor side extension on the basis that they feel it disrupts the rhythm of the terrace along Victoria Road and is not in accordance with SPG1A sections C to F and SPG2 section C. However for the reasons set out the proposed extension is considered to preserve and enhance the character of the building and conservation area, replacing an unsympathetic addition with an extension which harmonises with the dwelling and streetscene in terms of design, materials and detailing. SPG2 part C states that extensions in conservation areas..."should generally be confined to the rear or least important facades and should not upset the scale or proportions of the building, or adversely affect the character or setting of neighbouring buildings". It is important to note that the supplementary planning guidance uses the word "generally". As such, this is not a hard and fast "rule" and on assessment of this application, taking into account the site and surrounding such as the variation in style and design of one and two storey extensions to each of the corner properties on this junction of Albert Road and Victoria Road, the development is not considered to "upset the proportions of the building or adversely affect the character or setting of neighbouring building". On the contrary the design and detailing is considered to preserve and enhance the character of the conservation area, especially in light of the existing development to this side elevation. On this basis, the development is deemed to comply with policy UD4, CSV1, CSV5 and SPG1a, SPG2.

In terms of impact on residential amenity the extension would be located on the road side elevation of an end of terrace property. As such, there will be no impact on any neighbours in terms of outlook. The extension would have one additional window at first floor level and a door at ground floor level. Although there are two existing windows to the side elevation of number 65 Victoria Road, the separation distance between the buildings is deemed to be adequate and would not result in significant additional overlooking above

and beyond the current arrangement. On this basis, the development is to comply with policy UD3 and SPD Housing.

Erection of single storey rear/side extension

The single storey rear/side extension would be 1.50m deep from the furthest rear building line and follow back into the side return. The extension would be 5.20m deep and 2.60m wide within the side return and thus would create a full width rear extension. The height of the development would be 2.95m to the eaves rising to 3.20m including the rooflights. The part of the extension beyond the original rear addition would be permitted development and the application would extend up to 3.0m into the garden without planning permission. As such it is only the part of the extension to the side of the rear addition which requires planning permission.

The extension would be rendered concrete with three sets of two metal framed doors. The extension would not be visible from the street elevation as it would be obscured by the replaced boundary wall. While modern in appearance the extension is considered to be of acceptable proportions, design and detailing and would not have a significant adverse impact on the character of the conservation area.

Stroud Green CAAC have also objected to the ground floor extension on the basis of its width and height and door design in relation to SPG1a section F which states that "Extensions...should be subordinate in scale to the original building and should respect its architectural character and ...development...should not over or dominate existing features important to the building. For example, to ensure subordination, full width rear extensions are not normally considered acceptable and they should not extend more than two thirds the width of the rear of the house and should remain at least one storey below the eaves". Again, it should be noted that guidance uses this scenario as an "example" and also qualifies this by saying extension of the like "are not normally" considered acceptable. This allows scope to apply the guidance on a case by case basis taking into account the individual site characteristics and constraints.

It should also be noted that this guidance was devised prior to the 2008 amendments to the general permitted development order. In allowing 3m full width extensions under permitted development the move to allowing such extensions under full planning permission (even in conservation areas) is becoming more common and accepted, provided the design is appropriate and there is not significant harm to neighbours.

In this case the plots are oriented north-east to south-west. As such, there will be very minimal impact on the neighbour at number 69 as a result of overshadowing. A 45 degree line off the extension falls below a point 2m off ground level off ground level indicating that daylight in this room will not be significantly affected according to BRE guide "Site Layout Planning For Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice". Also, it should be noted that in a traditional terrace arrangement where there is a typical "L" shaped rear projection the depth of this feature is approximately 6.7m. In this case the existing depth is 3.7m and with the addition of the extension at 1.50m beyond the existing building line would create an extension of 5.20m which is less than a standard terrace. The extension is also to be sunk slightly into the ground (and the internal floor levels would involve two steps down into the kitchen extension) to further reduce the impact on the neighbour. Furthermore, there has been no objection from the neighbour and in fact 69c has written in support of the application. On this basis, the development is deemed to be acceptable and in accordance with policy UD3, UD4, CSV1, CSV5 and SPG1a, SPG2 and SPD Housing.

Demolition of garden wall and erection of new garden wall

The existing boundary wall which runs the side elevation on Albert Road right back to the garage and also wraps around to the front garden elevation, is rendered and painted white. The wall has become a visual eyesore through lack of maintenance with parts of the render coming away and other parts being overgrown by moss/algae. It is proposed to completely rebuild the wall replacing the existing with a wall of the same height and dimensions but constructed out of brick to match the existing. The proposed replacement wall will preserve and enhance the character of the building and conservation area and will have no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours.

Other works are proposed which do not in themselves require planning permission, such as replacing the existing front door reinstating a traditional Victorian style front door and also removing non-original features from above the front elevation ground floor bay window.

Overall the proposed development is deemed to be acceptable and in line with relevant policy.

CIL APPLICABLE

N/A

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The proposed side extension, rear/side extension and replacement garden wall are deemed to be acceptable in terms of design, detailing and materials and will preserve the character of the conservation area and not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours. The application is in accordance with policy UD3 "General Principles", UD4 "Quality Design", CSV1 "Development in Conservation Areas", CSV5 "Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas" of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and SPG1a "Design Guidance", SPG2 "Conservation and Archaeology" and SPD Housing of the Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents. On this basis, it is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Registered No: HGY/2012/1716

Applicant's drawing No's: VR/P/E01; VR/P/E02; VR/P/E03; VR/P/L02; VR/P/L01; VR/P/P01 VR/P/P02; VR/P/P03

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. The external materials to be used for garden/boundary wall and the two storey side extension shall be constructed of bricks in colour, size, shape, texture to match the existing dwelling and the mortar colour and brick bond shall match the existing dwelling. The roof shall be natural slate. The windows shall be timber sash windows painted white to match the existing. the proposed development shall.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality.

4. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The proposal has been assessed against and found to comply with relevant planning policy including UD3 "General Principles", UD4 "Quality Design", CSV1 "Development in Conservation Areas", CSV5 "Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas" of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and SPG1a "Design Guidance", SPG2 "Conservation and Archaeology" and SPD Housing of the Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents.

Appendix 9

Ward	
Road	
Online ref	
VOID	
HGY	

PLANNING APPLICATION VALIDITY CHECKLIST

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION / PAPER APPLICATION

LOCATION:.....

.....

PS CODE:

☐

Conservation area: Yes/No

Major application: Yes/No

PROPOSAL.....

.....

.....

.....

Fee Information		Plans	
Fee received		Extra copies required	
Fee required		Application form:	
Extra fee required		Declaration signature	
Fee refund		Certificate signature	
Payment Method			
Receipt number			

Satisfactory plans / any further plans required?	
Elevations	
Floor plans	
Photographs	
1:1250 OS map with the property outlined in RED	
Design & access statement	
Any other information	

E.I.A. Is site over 0.5 ha: YES/NO

Scoping ☐ Screening ☐

VALIDATION OFFICER SM.....CASE OFFICER.....

DATE REVD BY LPA.....DATE VALIDATED.....