

Our Ref. 1635BA001

Date: 14th March 2023

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

Application for Erection of single storey ground floor side and rear 'wraparound' extension to rear of property; Formation of rear roof dormer extension; Installation of front roof lights and replacement of front facing windows with new vertically sliding sash and casement windows.

PROPERTY: 11 Edison Road, London, Hornsey, London, N8 8AE

1.0. Location

- 1.1 The application site is located on Edison Road a short residential street that curves south-easterly from Coleridge Road to Crouch End Hill. Nos 12 and 10 adjoin to the north-west and south-east.
- 1.2 The property falls within a consecutive terrace of two storey properties on the western side of Edison Road that are identical in character to the adjoining terrace on the southern side of Coleridge Road.
- 1.3 The dwellings are constructed of red brick and include white painted detailing, including a prominent cornice at roof level. They also have very small front gardens behind dwarf boundary walls.
- 1.4 The application site falls within the Crouch End Conservation Area (CA). 3.3 The fronts of properties on Edison Road and other roads contributes to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset, while the rear to properties has a more neutral effect.

2.0. Front

- 2.1 The proposals include replacement of the front façade windows which are at present different from the vertically sliding sash and casement windows that the original property was installed with. The proposed replacement windows will be double glazed white painted timber windows of a traditional design with vertically sliding sash and casement detailing.

3.0. Rear / Side Extension

- 3.1 The proposal is for the erection of a single storey ground floor side and rear 'wraparound' extension to the rear of property, infilling most of the side return passage. It would run parallel to the outrigger.
- 3.2 The extension would now project slightly beyond the existing rear elevation of the current ground floor lean-to element forming the rear of the outrigger.
- 3.3 The extension would be faced in brick to match existing. Owing to its scale and depth and orientation of the current outrigger the extension here while relatively large in size, will still be proportionate and subordinate to the host building and be in keeping with the pattern of development in the immediate area. It would be similar to that at No.10. The proposal is not so large or prominent as to be dominant, nor does it compete with the host building or its neighbours.



Principal: Donald M. Shearer, Bsc.(Arch),
RIBA,ARB (Registered Architect)



3.0. Rear / Side Extension (cont)

- 3.4 The existing rear elevation to the property is not visible from the public vantage points. The visibility of such an extension would not be substantial from neighbouring properties given the current height and depth of the outrigger to this property and presence of intervening fences.
- 3.5 The extension is viewed as was the previous approval to have a limited effect on the character and appearance of this property and would not cause harm to the significance of the CA as a designated asset, therefore preserving its character and appearance.

4.0. Dormer and front roof lights

- 4.1 Rear dormer roof extensions and front roof lights are a common, established feature of the surrounding properties of the same design in this street and part of the CA. This includes large, and full-width, rear dormers.
- 4.2 The rear dormer extension is amended to a lower height than previously approved to eliminate the setback of approximately 0.5m from the adjacent side boundary of the roof with No.12.
- 4.3 The result is that while wider, the dormer being slightly lower is considered sufficiently subservient to the roof, with visible roof appearing above, below, and the existing parapet to its sides. Along with its tiled finish, the result would be subordinate and proportionate to the original property and would not harm the character of the CA.
- 4.4 The front roof lights would be limited in number and sited high on the roof to minimise their prominence. Most neighbouring examples are lower down or greater in number.
- 4.5 The roof additions are therefore viewed to have a limited effect on the character and appearance of this property and would not cause harm to the significance of the CA as a designated asset, therefore preserving its character and appearance.

5.0. Impact on amenity

- 5.1 While it is accepted the extension will introduce a relatively high wall on the common boundary with No 12, this would not lead to unacceptable tunnelling effect, sufficient to cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers, in terms of light and outlook.
- 5.2 As per the existing deep and high outrigger to No 11 outlook and conditions of light to No 12 are already constrained as well as affected by orientation. Mindful of this context, the extension as per the proposed plans will not adversely affect current conditions in terms of light and outlook any more than the previously approved plan through reductions in the height of the separating wall between 11 & 12.
- 5.3 In terms of understanding loss of light, it is also important to bear in mind that daylight is dependent on how much clear sky is visible from a particular window/ specific reference. The visible surface of the extension will not lead to any significant amount of visible sky lost as seen from the side windows to No 12. 3.16 It is also noted that the outrigger to the back of No 12 sits at an angle and splays away as such increasing the separation between it and the boundary with No 11.
- 5.4 Overall the height and depth of the extension would not result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight, or have an overbearing appearance to the neighbouring properties. 3.18 The rear dormer would sit within the taller and deeper main dwelling house and its volume would be very limited compared to it, to a degree that its physical impacts would be insufficient to harm neighbouring daylight, sunlight, or outlook.



5.0. Impact on amenity (cont)

- 5.5 Its rear facing window would face the same direction as the existing upper floor windows, and neighbouring dormers, in these properties. Therefore, it would not cause material increases in overlooking and associated privacy loss. Nor would the front facing roof lights cause such harm given their limited size, quantity, and street/ skyfacing orientation.
- 5.6 We respectfully submit that the proposed development is in general accordance with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also accords with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.
- 5.7 The proposal would comply with Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan 2017 and will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Donald Shearer ARB RIBA



Principal: Donald M. Shearer, Bsc.(Arch),
RIBA, ARB (Registered Architect)

