

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1253
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	Ground Floor Flat, 42 Alexandra Park Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2AD
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension and cellar excavation to improve head height for storage room. New staircase to cellar
Case Officer:	Emily Whittredge
Valid Date:	10/05/2023
Applicant:	Mr Mendes
Agent:	Mrs Arita Beqiri

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Site Description

The application relates to the ground floor flat within a three-storey mid-terrace residential conversion on the south east side of Alexandra Park Road.

The site falls within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area and does not relate to any listed building.

2. Policies and Constraints

Muswell Hill Conservation Area DM DPD policy: DM9

Critical Drainage Area, DM DPD policy: DM26

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

HGY/2023/0729 - Construction of new garden building, demolition of existing garden building - 19/05/2023 Approve with Conditions

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

HGY/2023/0729 - Construction of new garden building, demolition of existing garden building - Approve with Conditions 19/05/2023

4. Neighbour Consultations and Publicity

No comments were received in response to neighbour notification or publicity of the application.

5. Design

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 and 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. London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

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, 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.

The site is located within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area, where the impact of development must be given appropriate weight. The proposal is sited to the rear of the terrace where there would be limited views from the public highway; however, the special character and appearance of the conservation area is derived from private views as well as public ones. Therefore, the impact of development must be assessed in this context, along with the usual design considerations of Policy DM1.

The original terrace is characterised by single storey rear wings 5m long, and there are some examples in the terrace where these have been extended to full width. There are few examples where extensions project beyond the original rear building line, and largely these are modest projections. Notably, the longest extension is at the neighbouring property, no. 44, which has a partial-width extension to the outrigger approximately 5m long and 3.6m wide. No formal permission is recorded for this development.

The application seeks a full-width rear addition to the existing ground floor flat extending 4.9m from the outrigger and a total of 9.9m beyond the principal rear elevation, at a height of 3m. Two courtyard areas would be retained to the rear of the original terrace. In the context of the wider terrace, the length and width of the proposed footprint greatly exceeds existing patterns of development. The extension would wrap around the existing single storey projection at a slightly lower height, obscuring original window and door openings, which would result in a cluttered and incongruous appearance. The rear elevation of the extension would have a large set of glazed doors and a smaller horizontal opening offset within a large area of brickwork, which would serve to amplify the structure's width and bulk. By reason of its height, length, siting and detailed design, the addition would fail to relate well to the original rear elevation and would appear overly dominant to the host building and the wider terrace, adversely affecting the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Permission was recently granted for a large outbuilding near the rear boundary measuring 5.5m wide, 6m deep and 2.5m tall with a flat roof. The permission is extant and is therefore a material consideration when assessing further development of the site. The proposed rear extension, in addition to the outbuilding, would significantly reduce the length of the original garden and would be out of keeping with the prevailing scale of development to the rear of the terrace. Cumulatively, the scale and footprint of the approved outbuilding with the proposed extension would represent an overdevelopment of the original site and would undermine the special character of this part of the conservation area.

6. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

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.

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 avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

While a small lightwell along the boundary with no. 40 is included, the development is substantial and would extend almost 10m on the boundary with no. 40 at a height of 3m. There is currently no structures on this boundary beyond the boundary fence and as such, a development of this scale would have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring residents by reason of harm to outlook, overshadowing and a sense of overbearing. The proposal would therefore cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring occupiers. The proposed extension would be in line with the neighbouring extension at no. 44 and would therefore not materially impact upon light or outlook to this property.

A small area of excavation is proposed to the existing 10.8m² cellar below the building, which would lower its floor level by 0.55m. The scale of this excavation is minor and is unlikely to have an impact on structural stability or flooding, and in this instance a full basement impact assessment was not considered necessary. A condition could be added to require that excavation work is undertaken in accordance with structural engineer's approved specifications.

7. Conclusion

The proposed extension, by reason of its bulk, scale and design, would detract from the architectural character of the terrace and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1 and DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan.

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

8. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by reason of its height, length, siting and detailed design, would be out of keeping with the original rear elevation and would appear overly dominant to the host building and the wider terrace. The proposal would therefore **adversely affect the visual amenity of the locality** and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1 and DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan.

The proposed development by reason of its height, length, scale and siting would be detrimental to the amenities of adjacent occupiers due to overbearing, overshadowing and harm to outlook. As such, this development is contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policies SP0 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and is inconsistent with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Pre-application Advice

Taking the reason(s) for refusal into account, you may wish to prepare a revised proposal for comment prior to submitting a further planning application. To do so we strongly recommend you seek pre-application advice and refer you to our Pre-Application Planning Advice (PAPA) Service.

<https://www.haringey.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning>