

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0707
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	23 Elms Avenue, Hornsey, London, N10 2JN
Proposal	Demolition of existing first floor side orangery and single storey ground floor rear extension. New enlarged first floor side orangery. Three storey rear extension with re-alignment of existing roof.
Case Officer	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date	13/03/2023
Applicant	Ms. Andrea Savva
Agent	Mr Jeffrey Atkins

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 No representations were received in response to notification and publicity of the application.

1.2 The following issues were raised by neighbours, local groups and Councillors:

- No responses

2. REASONS FOR REFUSING PERMISSION

2.1 The subject site is a two storey-residential dwellinghouse, set at the end of a terrace of houses on the western end of Elms Avenue. The properties on the south side of the street, which this site sits, are all in semi-detached pairs and there is a strong sensation of symmetry amongst them.

2.2 The site is located within Muswell Hill conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

2.3 The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision.

2.4 The proposal seeks the demolition and replacement/enlargement of an existing side orangery of similar aesthetic and materials. Additionally, the proposal seeks the formation of three-storey stepped rear extension with a depth of 4.15m at the ground floor, 2.95m at the first floor, and 1.95m at the third floor.

2.5 Materially the proposals would be finished in materials sensitive to the host dwellinghouse, and in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. In specific the proposed orangery would be finished in white painted timber with glazing in a pattern that would match the host dwellinghouse. The proposed extension would be faced in brick to match the existing with windows and roofing tile to match also.

2.6 The proposed alterations to the existing orangery are seen to bring a positive change to the flank elevation of the existing dwellinghouse. The larger size and matching glazing would prove an attractive feature and an improvement compared to the existing orangery.

2.7 The proposal, with respect to the rear extension, is considered to be overly bulky, and would not appear sub-ordinate to the host dwellinghouse. Officers note that there are examples of two-storey rear extensions on this side of the street however these properties do not have the third-floor addition. Furthermore, the design does not related well to the existing building and would appear an awkward and uncomplimentary addition and an incongruous feature in the street scene.

2.8 Additionally, it is deemed that, due to the visibility of the flank of the application site from the street, the additional bulk added to the rear of the property would not enhance the character of the conservation area. Officers deem that the additional depth added to the rear would be out of character for a building of this typology and therefore cannot be supported.

2.9 As stated in paragraph 2.1, the properties on this side of the street benefit from a high level of symmetry, noted by the bay windows, glazing pattern, and third floor additions to the rear of the roofs, as well a chimney pots protruding from these that are visible from the front elevation.

2.10 Officers note that these features form part of the character of this terrace and therefore the conservation area as a whole. The proposal would see the removal of the aforementioned chimney at the rear. Officers note that this feature isn't wholly consistent along the terrace, however it is in the interest of the character of the area that this feature is retained where possible and therefore the removal of this cannot be supported.

2.11 In summary, the proposed orangery would be acceptable, however the proposed rear extension would be overly bulky and appear insubordinate to the host dwellinghouse. Overall the impact on the host dwellinghouse and the character of the conservation area would be more than substantial and the proposal cannot be supported.

2.12 Officers suggest that for the proposal to be deemed as acceptable, the third floor element of the extension be removed from the proposal, and the maximum depth of the first floor extension be limited to 2.5m at a maximum in an effort to appear subordinate and minimise impact on Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

2.13 The proposed three storey extension would extend along the rear boundary of 24 and 26 Muswell Road, across the end those properties gardens, these neighbours are sited to the north west of the application site. No daylight/sunlight study has been submitted in support of the application. While the rear windows of these properties are probably far enough away from the proposed extension not to be amatorially affected, there are concerns that the extension will increase overshadowing of these houses rear gardens. Notwithstanding the impact on light, the extension would have an overbearing and unneighbourly relationship with those properties, reducing the occupiers' enjoyment of their rear gardens, to the detriment of their amenity.

2.13 The proposed development is considered to be inadequate to align with Policies DM1, DM9, and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. Further the proposed development, by virtue of impact on the host dwellinghouse and character of the conservation area is not in accordance with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF and cannot be supported.

2.14 The proposal is deemed to be in contravention with Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan 2017 and does not do enough to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.15 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed first and second floor rear extension by reason of its design, bulk, massing, loss of original detail and lack of symmetry, would appear an overly large and dominant addition, out of keeping with the character and appearance of this property and terrace, harming the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area, contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1 and DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposed three-storey rear extension by reason of its height, bulk and massing, would have an overbearing relationship with properties in Muswell Road that back on to the application site, potentially causing overshadowing of their rear gardens and reducing the occupiers' enjoyment of those gardens to the detriment of their residential amenity and contrary to policy D1 and D12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017.