

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4026
Type	Full planning permission
Location	Flat 1, 130 Muswell Hill Road, Hornsey, London, N10 3JD
Proposal	Side infill extension to existing rear extension, replacement of existing faulty flat roof and internal alteration.
Case Officer	Ben Coffie
Valid Date	16/11/2022
Applicant	Rebecca & Nicholas Napolitano
Agent	Ms Dani Schmidt

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

1.1 Planning permission is sought for a side infill extension to existing rear extension, replacement of existing faulty flat roof and internal alteration.

Site and Surroundings

1.2 The application site is a terrace dwelling house fronting Muswell Hill Road to the east. Whilst the Muswell Hill conservation area is within proximity, the site does not fall within the conservation area, and it does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

1.3 No relevant planning history.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of 9 letters to neighbouring occupants. No representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc. in response to notification and publicity of the application.

3. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Design & impact on the character and appearance of the area

3.1 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 taken into

account. 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, in order to be sensitive to context.

3.2 The site benefits from an existing single storey rear extension which measures approximately 6.6m in depth, 2.6m in height and 3.2m in width. The proposed addition would maintain the same depth and height however would extend along the shared boundary with the adjoining site no.128 Muswell Hill, therefore would result in a total width of 6.4m.

3.3 The bulk, massing, design and choice of materials for the proposed the extension would respect the scale, form and character of the host building and the wider area. The proposal is therefore acceptable with regards to design.

3.4 Consequently, the proposed extensions would not represent an intrusive addition to the host property and general area given the presence of larger extensions in the vicinity.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

3.4 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.

3.5 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 resident.

3.6 It is acknowledged that the proposed enlargement would not result in a further projection beyond the existing rear extension, therefore it would not impact upon the amenity of no. 132 as the current setting would be maintained. However, the enlargement to be situated along the shared boundary with no. 128 with a depth of 5.4m would exacerbate concerns regarding loss of daylight/sunlight, an increased sense of enclosure.

3.7 As such, due to the excessive depth and close proximity of the proposed extension would inflict adverse impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by occupiers of the neighbouring property no. 128 contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan and policy DM1 of the DPD.

Conclusions

3.8 The proposal is considered unacceptable and would result in undue harm against the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring sites.

3.9 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

5. CIL APPLICABLE

5.1 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.

Refusal Reasons:

The excessive depth and close proximity of the proposed extension would adversely impact the amenity currently enjoyed by occupiers of the neighbouring property No. 128, in terms of conditions of light and outlook, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan and policy DM1 of the DPD.