

# Officer's Report

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number</b> | <b>HGY/2023/1338</b>                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Type</b>               | <b>Householder planning permission</b>                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Location</b>           | 72 Priory Road, Hornsey, London, N8 7EY                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Proposal</b>           | Demolition of existing single storey garage and utility room to the side of the property and the erection of a new single storey side extension to form a study at the dwellinghouse. |
| <b>Case Officer</b>       | Oskar Gregersen                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Valid Date</b>         | 18/05/2023                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>Applicant</b>          | Mr Daniel Cheifetz                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Agent</b>              |                                                                                                                                                                                       |

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Refuse**

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

#### **1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

The proposed extension, by virtue of its prominent location and excessive bulk and scale, would appear an over dominant, insubordinate and uncomplimentary form of development, at odds with the character of the original property and of the wider area, and would appear an obtrusive and incongruous feature in the streetscene detrimental to local visual amenity and contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan (2017) and policies DM1 & DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).

#### **2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS**

Proposed development

2.1 This is an application for the demolition of an existing single-storey garage and utility room, and erection of a side extension 10.35m deep, with an eaves height of 3.1m and a maximum height of 3.7m.

2.2 The proposed side extension would be finished in materials to match the existing, with a bay window added to the front elevation.

Site and Surroundings

2.3 The application site is a semi-detached dwellinghouse, a short distance from Alexandra Palace Park, benefitting from large front and rear gardens. The site fronts Priory Road, with a small green area separating the application site from Priory Road. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of architectural styles and rooflines, with many properties having bay windows and gables, however these details are not wholly consistent.

2.4 The site is not located within any conservation area, nor is it locally listed.

#### Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

2.5.1 HGY/2022/4421 | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3.25m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m

Refuse

2.5.2 HGY/2023/0292 | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 3.75m, for which the maximum height would be 3.25m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m

Approve

2.5.3 HGY/2023/0323 | Proposed 3m rear extension and loft conversion comprising rear dormer.

Permitted Development

### **3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

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

- No responses

### **4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

The application has been publicised by way 31 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: 1

Objecting: 0

Supporting: 1

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:

- No objections

The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- No objections

### **5 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

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

## **Design and appearance**

5.2 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.

5.3 Permission is sought for the demolition of an existing garage, and utility room, and its replacement with a 10.35m deep single-storey side extension, that would be 3.4m wide, with a maximum height of 3.7m and an eaves height of 3.1m. The proposed side extension would have a bay window to match the existing bay window on the front elevation and would be finished in hung tile to match the existing ground floor on the front, and brick on its flank.

5.4 Officers note that there are extant permissions in place for rear extensions of significant size, notably a prior approval for a 3.75m deep rear extension approved under HGY/2023/0292. If this proposal for a side extension were to be approved, and the maximum extent of all permissions built out, this would create a wall 3m tall and 14.12m deep along the eastern edge of the site and would create a wrap-around extension of excessive and insubordinate size.

5.5 The material choice of the proposal would match the host dwellinghouse and would appear sensitive to the surrounding area.

5.6 It is deemed that, although sensitive to the character of the area in materials, the proposal would constitute an over development of the site and would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwellinghouse. The proposal would also fail to follow the pattern of development in the area. Overall, the proposed development would not be in general accordance with DPD Policies DM1 or DM12, Local Plan (2017) policies SP11, or London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

## **Impact on neighbouring amenity**

5.7 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.

5.8 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.

5.9 The proposed development would be situated at the eastern boundary of the site and would be separated from any neighbouring properties by a considerable distance and therefore there is unlikely to be any issues of loss in privacy or overshadowing of the side extension. Additionally, there are no side facing windows proposed that would cause issues of overlooking or overshadowing.

5.10 In general, the proposed side extension is seen not to be overly impactful on neighbouring amenity by virtue of its positioning and orientation of the site and is seen to adhere to the amenity portions of London Plan Policy D6 as well as the text of DPD policy DM1 pertaining to amenity. Notwithstanding this, the proposal cannot be supported as it would constitute an overdevelopment of the site that would introduce an overly bulky and incongruous feature.

## **Conclusion**

5.11 The proposal is considered not acceptable as it would appear overbearing on the host dwellinghouse and would not appear subordinate. Additionally, when considering the potential level of development if all extant permissions were built out, the resulting wrap around extension would cover an excessive level of the site and would appear bulky and incongruous.

5.12 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 extension, by virtue of its prominent location and excessive bulk and scale, would appear an over dominant, insubordinate and uncomplimentary form of development, at odds with the character of the original property and of the wider area, and would appear an obtrusive and incongruous feature in the streetscene detrimental to local visual amenity and contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan (2017) and policies DM1 & DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).