

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4369
Type	Full planning permission
Location	11-13 Lockmead Road, London N15 6BX
Proposal	Ground floor front extensions and first floor front and rear extensions at no. 13
Case Officer	Zara Seelig
Valid Date	16/01/2023
Applicant	Messrs Allan/Abraham Lesser/Low
Agent	Mr Sruli Lieberman

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

The proposed first floor front extensions, by reason of their size & design would appear out of proportion with, and unsympathetic to, the host property. They would result in an overly dominant and incongruous addition to the streetscene, out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area, and detrimental to local visual amenity, contrary to Policies DM1 & DM12 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (Adopted July 2017), and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (Adopted 2017), and contrary to the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF 2021.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

Ground floor front extensions and first floor front and rear extensions at no. 13.

Site and Surroundings

The application sites are two two storey dwellings situated on the Northern side of Lockmead Road. The site is not located within a conservation area, it is not a listed building and there are no TPO's on the site.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows.

11 Lockmead Road:

OLD/1989/0786 - 25/1/89 Erection of extension to roof to provide three additional bedrooms and bathroom. – Granted Permission

HGY/1990/0342 - Erection of roof extension to provide 2 additional bedrooms and shower room. – Granted Permission

13 Lockmead Road:

HGY/1991/0151 - Erection of single storey rear extension. – Granted permission

OLD/2004/0007 - Proposed Side and rear extension. – Refused permission

HGY/2021/2520 - Erection of front side and rear first floor extensions. – Refused permission

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal: None

External: None

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 4 neighbour consultation letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:

Supporting: None

Objecting: None

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- None

The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- None

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance; and
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 proposal would not be considered acceptable in terms of design, the proposed rear first floor extension is considered acceptable with a simple design and materials to match, however, the proposed front extensions would not be subservient, appearing incongruous, with an uncharacteristic roof form. The proposed front extensions would be prominent and highly visible in the street scene, out of character with the surrounding area and would not comply with relevant policies that seek to promote high quality design.

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.

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.

The proposed rear first floor extension at no. 13 would be set in from the boundary line with attached neighbouring property of no. 15 by over 3 metres, it would not project further in depth than the existing rear building line of adjacent neighbouring property no. 11. The front extensions, although in isolation could be considered to impact the neighbouring property of no. 11 or 13, as they are both constructing similar extensions to the front, the proposals would not be considered to adversely impact the amenities of these two properties. The two storey front extensions would be located over 3 metres away from both no.s 9 and 15. The proposal would therefore not adversely impact the amenities of these neighbouring properties by reason of overbearingness, loss of daylight/sunlight or loss of privacy.

Parking

Although the proposal will result in a loss of garage off street parking for no. 11, the majority of houses within that row appear to have converted their garage space to habitable space and so would not be out of character within the area. There is on street parking available on Lockmead Road and therefore would be considered acceptable.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of design and does not comply with relevant planning policies.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. 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 for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed first floor front extensions, by reason of their size & design would appear out of proportion with, and unsympathetic to, the host property. They would result in an overly dominant and incongruous addition to the streetscene, out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area, and detrimental to local visual amenity, contrary to Policies DM1 & DM12 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (Adopted July 2017), and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (Adopted 2017), and contrary to the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF 2021.