

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0510
Type	Full planning permission
Location	70 Duckett Road, Hornsey, London, N4 1BW
Proposal	Replacement of existing rear extension with a wraparound ground floor extension and replacement of rear windows on first floor level with the addition of juliette balconies.
Case Officer	Ben Coffie
Valid Date	21/02/2023
Applicant	Francis Vaughan
Agent	Ms Dani Schmidt

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

1.1 This is an application for the replacement of existing rear extension with a wraparound ground floor extension, replacement of two first floor rear windows and addition of juliette balconies.

1.2 The proposed replacement extension would measure 2.7m in height, its rear element would project by 3.1m and its side element would project along the boundary by 9m.

Site and Surroundings

1.2 The application site is a two-storey terrace dwelling located on the south side of Duckett Road, the dwelling is characterised by a front bay window, brick finished and outrigger and an existing to the rear. The site does not fall within a conservation area, and it does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/20222/2255- Certificate of lawfulness for a proposed outbuilding at the rear of the garden.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of 20 letters to neighbouring occupants. No representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc. in response to notification and publicity of the application.

No of individual responses: 0

Objecting: 0

Supporting: 0

Neither: 0

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 proposed scale, bulk and height of the wraparound extension is considered proportionate and compatible with the existing setting of the host dwelling and the rear garden environment. Consequently, the proposed extensions would not represent an intrusive addition to the host property and general area given its presence would not be visible within the streetscene.

3.3 The proposed replacement windows with the introduction of Juliette balconies are considered minor changes and would not result in any detrimental impacts to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

3.4 As such the proposed development is considered acceptable and compliant with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and policy DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017).

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

3.5 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.

3.6 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.

3.7 The dwellings within the terrace are built with two storey rear outriggers which project approximately by 6.5m. No amenity concerns are anticipated against the occupiers of no.72, as the extension would project beyond the outriggers by 3.1m. This projection is considered moderate.

3.8 However the side infill element of the extension would sit along the shared boundary with no.68 closing the existing 2.16m gap between the outrigger and the boundary. Due to the setting of the rear of the terrace, if infill extensions are not well designed with low heights as far as practical would result in tunnelling effect, in this scenario the proposed height of the extension at 2.7m would be too high by reason of the depth of the extension measuring 9m. Officers take the view that the proposed extension would cause an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook

against the occupants of no.68 due to the excessive depth and unacceptable height of the side infill element along the shared boundary.

3.9 As such, the proposed extension would inflict adverse impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and would fail to comply with policy D6 of the London Plan and policy DM1 of the DPD.

Conclusion

3.10 The proposal is considered unacceptable and would result in undue harm to the amenity of the occupants of the adjoining property.

3.11 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

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed single storey wraparound extension would inflict adverse impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by the occupiers of no.68 in terms of loss of outlook and an increased sense of enclosure due to its excessive height and depth, therefore would fail to comply with policy D6 of the London Plan and policies DM1 and DM12 of the DPD.