

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/2724
Type	Full planning permission
Location	26, Flexmere Road, London, N17 7AT
Proposal	Erection of ground and 1st floor side extension and rear 1st floor extensions
Case Officer	Sarah Madondo
Valid Date	04/11/2022
Applicant	Mr Oscar Osmar
Agent	Mr Oscar Osmar

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Site and Surroundings

The application site is situated on the eastern side of Flexmere Road and comprises an end of terrace dwelling. The site curtilage is approximately 30m in length and abuts Tottenham Cemetery to the rear of the site. The subject property is neither listed building or within a conservation area.

Design and appearance

Permission is sought for the erection for a two storey side extension including a first floor rear extension to provide additional bedrooms on the upper floors and a family room at ground floor. The extensions would be finished in materials to match the existing building.

Two storey side extension

The property forms part of short terrace comprising of 4 properties with deep front/rear gardens. The proposal involves the demolition of an existing structure on the side elevation and the erection of a two storey side extension without a setback. The lack of set back from the front elevation fails to ensure that the extension appeared appropriately subordinate to the original design of the house. In addition, the design of the side extension would appear awkward, bulky and out of keeping with the character of the original house, causing harm to the character of the property and surrounding area.

First floor extension

The proposal includes a first floor rear extension over the existing ground floor extension resulting in a two storey rear extension. The first floor extension would be stepped from the no. 24 and finished with a pitched roof. Given the scale of the proposed extension and its form, it would fail to respect the character or appearance of this property and would represent particularly poor design. It would be an incongruous and overly dominant new feature that would be at odds with the positive design characteristics of these terraced houses. Accepting poor design would result in harm to the character and appearance of this dwelling and would make other similar proposals more difficult to resist.

Impact on the neighbouring amenity

Given that the property is end of terrace and the gap between no 24 & 26, it is considered that this property would not be impacted. In relation to no. 28 the first floor extension would be stepped as result this property would not be significantly harmed. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in amenity terms.

Conclusion

Given the scale of the extensions in relation to the existing property would result in an unsympathetic and overly dominant extensions, which would not be subordinate in scale the proposal, and that would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host property the area.

The proposal would detract from the character and appearance of this property and the wider area and would represent poor design. It would conflict with the design aspirations of Policies DM1 and DM12 of Development Management Development Plan Document 2017; and Policy SP11 of the Strategic Polices Development Plan Document 2017. As these are consistent with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposal would result in unsympathetic extensions that would not be subordinate in scale to the host property and that would appear over dominant and incongruous additions, out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and wider the area, to the detriment of local visual amenity and contrary to Policy DM1 & DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of Haringey Strategic Polices DPD (2017).