

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0685
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	74 - 76 Alexandra Gardens, Hornsey, London, N10 3RL
Proposal	Erection of part single, part two-storey rear extension.
Case Officer	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date	27/04/2023
Applicant	STANLEY LAUFER
Agent	Mr Barry Whymark

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the erection of a part single, part two-storey rear extension to 74-76 Alexandra Gardens. The proposed ground floor element would be 3.1m tall, and 3.2m deep. The first floor element would be 1.6m deep. The proposal would see the retention of access to the rear garden via a set of metal stairs from the upper floor, with access to the rear garden retained through double doors at the ground floor. The permission is sought to provide larger kitchens for both dwellings.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is formed of two purpose-built Edwardian flats atop one another. The site forms part of a terrace of ten such buildings in the same arrangement. The terrace has seen very little development to the rear, with many of the outriggers maintaining their symmetrical character. Further Officers note that the terrace has attractive detailing on the front elevation with many sites retaining original timber sash windows with attractive glazing and being finished in red brick.

3.3 The site is not located within any conservation area, however the properties to the southeast, that border the garden of the application site, are within Rookfield Conservation Area.

3.4 There are some trees in the rear garden however these are deemed to be far enough away from the proposed development that their Root Protection Areas (RPA's) would not be affected.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

3.6 There is no planning history in relation to the site.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

- No consultees

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 39 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: 2

Objecting: 2

Supporting: 0

5.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- None

5.3 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- None

5.4 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:

- Loss of light
- Overshadowing
- Loss of privacy
- Out of character

5.5 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Loss of a private view

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and appearance

6.2 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.

6.3 Permission is sought for a part single, part first-floor rear extension to facilitate larger kitchens to both dwellings. The proposed rear extension would be 3.2m deep at ground floor level and would protrude 1.6m from the rear at first-floor level. The ground floor portion of the extension

would be 3.1m tall, and the first-floor portion 3.5m tall, totalling 6.1m. The extensions would see the kitchens of both flats made larger to accommodate space for dining.

6.4 Officers note that this application was amended once already, with the LPA suggesting that the complete removal of the first-floor addition is all that would be acceptable, however amended plans submitted contained the first-floor addition simply at a reduced depth.

6.5 The proposed extension would be finished in materials sensitive to the host dwellings and would blend with the surrounding area. Notwithstanding this, the additional bulk added to the outriggers of these properties would interrupt what is a relatively untouched and symmetrical terrace of dwellings and would appear an incongruous addition to the properties.

6.6 This asymmetry with the surrounding dwellings, created by the bulk of the proposal, would therefore be in contravention with DPD policies DM1 and DM12, as it would not respect the context of the site or surrounding area and cannot be supported in design terms.

6.7 Overall, despite being finished in materials sensitive to the host dwelling, the proposal would not be in line with the pattern of development in the area and would introduce an incongruous feature that would be damaging to the appearance of the host dwellings and surrounding terrace and cannot be supported. If the first floor element were removed, and some measures taken to mitigate impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties the LPA would be open to an extension, however in its current form the proposal is unacceptable

Impact on neighbouring amenity

6.8 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. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

6.9 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.

6.10 With respect to the impact on neighbouring amenity, Officers deem the following issue with granting approval; The overbearing nature of the proposed extension created by virtue of its bulk and massing combined with the topography of the site.

6.11 Officers note that the site sits at the end of the terrace, where there appears to be a considerable slope downhill to the southwest. It appears from satellite imagery that there is some degree of drop between the rear garden of the application site and the neighbouring dwellings in the terrace. The proposed ground floor extension height of 3.1m would be exacerbated by this difference in height, and would create a sense of enclosure deemed to be unacceptable by the LPA. The first-floor addition, although shallower in depth, would add to this sensation of enclosure when viewed from the gardens of No. 70-72 Alexandra Road and is deemed to be overbearing.

6.12 Additionally, the re-positioning of the existing stairs from the first floor to the garden further out into the rear of the site could create issues of overlooking into neighbouring gardens, as the stairs are moved an additional 3.2m further to the rear, allowing people to look down into neighbouring gardens from the flat portion of the stairway created by the proposed extension.

6.13 By virtue of the points stated above, it is deemed that the proposed extension would be in contravention of London Plan Policy D6, as well as DPD Policy DM1, due to the development appearing overbearing and creating a sense of enclosure. The proposal could also lead to issues of overlooking into neighbouring gardens and by extension a loss of privacy due to the positioning of rear stairs further into the garden.

Conclusion

6.14 While the extension through its use of materials would reflect and respect the design of the original house given the siting and bulk of a combined rear and ground floor extension, it would appear visually prominent and an incongruous addition to the property.

6.15 Given also the established rear building line to properties on this side of the road, a first-floor extension would appear out of character with neighbouring properties and would interrupt the well-established symmetry that the properties in this terrace have as there has currently not been any development at the rear.

6.16 The proposal would impact conditions of light, outlook and create a sense of enclosure to the occupants of the adjoining property. Given the modest difference in levels between the outriggers of Nos. 74-76 and Nos. 72-70, and taking account of the depth and height of the first and ground floor rear extension on the shared boundary the extension would be harmful to amenity.

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

7. 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.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

For the following reason(s)

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development by reason of its bulk and mass, would introduce an incongruous addition harming the appearance of this property and interrupting the established symmetry and rear building line found in relation to this group of properties, contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposed development by reason of its siting and bulk would negatively impact on conditions

of light, outlook and create a sense of enclosure to the occupants of the adjoining property, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DM1 & DM12 of Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.