



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1244
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	121 Nightingale Lane, Hornsey, London, N8 7LG
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension
Case Officer:	Eunice Huang
Valid Date:	08/06/2023
Applicant:	Gemma Waugh
Agent:	KA Designs

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

2. REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 No consultation responses were received.

2.2 The application has been publicised by way of press advert, site notice and letters. No representations were received.

3. REASONS FOR REFUSAL

3.1 This is an application for the construction of a new single storey rear extension.

3.2 The application site is a two storey end of terrace dwelling. The site is located within Campsbourne Cottage Estate Conservation Area. It is not a listed building.

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

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

- Design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- Impact on neighbouring amenity

3.5 Policy SP11 of the Local Plan (2017) and Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) (DPD) seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. DPD Policy DM1 specifies that development proposals should relate positively to their locality, including having regard to building heights; and form, scale and massing prevailing around the site.

3.6 DPD Policy DM1 also 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 Policy SP12 of the Local Plan 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 'Management of the Historic Environment' 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. Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 supports these aims.

3.8 DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that residential extensions, 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 buildings.

3.9 DPD Policy DM12 expands that full width rear extensions are not normally considered acceptable and they should be lower than the ridge height of the host building. The depth of the rear extension should be such that the resulting footprint is subordinate to the main house and does not have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, ensuring no overlooking or inappropriate loss of daylight and sunlight.

3.10 The subject site belongs to a row of terraced cottages spanning from No. 121 to No. 135 Nightingale Lane; of which the main buildings display a consistent rear alignment. Each terrace in this row comprises a single storey outrigger subservient to the main building. The depth of the main building footprint at the subject site measures approximately 6.68m. The existing outrigger extends approximately 3.22m to the rear of the main building, and reaches a maximum height of 2.9m at the party wall on the boundary of No. 123. The adjoining outrigger at No. 123 has a similar rear alignment to the subject site.

3.11 It should be noted that the row of terraced houses to the south of the subject site differs in development pattern. These main buildings of these terraces have greater building depths, that extend beyond the rear elevations of the subject terrace row.

3.12 The proposed extension includes the infill of the side passageway of the outrigger, along with a rear extension extending 3m beyond the existing outrigger. Overall, the depth of the rear extension reaches approximately 6.22m. The width of the rear extension spans approximately 5m, across the width of the site. The height of the new extension reaches 3.25m at the parapets adjacent to the side boundaries.

3.13 The height, scale and massing of the full-width extension is not considered to relate positively to the site, host building and surrounding development. Contrary to DPD Policy DM12, the scale of the extension is not considered subordinate to the host building. In particular, the proposed footprint of the extension is considered to dominate the scale of the host building and surrounding developments.

3.14 In relation to neighbouring amenity – the proposed height and scale of the extension would result in adverse bulk impact on both adjoining properties. While No. 123s existing single storey extension and the additional depth of the the at No. 119 means that the proposed extension would only extend along the garden boundaries of those properties by approximately 3 metres, the additional height of the proposed extension resulting from the proposed parapets would result in an overbearing relationship with neighbouring properties and result in an increased sense of

enclosure exacerbated by the relative narrowness of those properties gardens. No side elevation drawings have been submitted for the proposed northern elevation. Nonetheless, based on the proposed southern side elevation drawing, it can be posited that the proposed development would be present an expanse of blank masonry wall on the northern boundary.

3.15 Thus, the proposed development is not in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD 2017, or Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017.

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

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by reason of its height and scale, would result in an over dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to this property, detracting from the appearance of the host building and the row of terraced cottages it forms a part of, and harming the character and appearance of the Campsbourne Cottage Estate conservation area, contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed height and scale of the extension would result in it have an overbearing and unneighbourly relationship with adjoining properties resulting in an increased sense of enclosure detrimental to neighbouring amenity, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).