



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1550
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	73 Duckett Road, Hornsey, London, N4 1BL
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey ground floor side infill extension
Case Officer:	Ben Coffie
Valid Date:	13/06/2023
Applicant:	Mr Thomas Sleep
Agent:	Mr Jamie Sleep

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

Planning permission is sought for a side infill extension to an existing rear extension to wrap-around the existing two storey outrigger.

The side infill element would be located along the eastern shared boundary, projecting at a depth of 7.3m. The extension would have a height of 3.1m and project beyond the existing outrigger by 2.1m.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a terrace dwelling located on the northern side of Duckett Road. The site is not located in a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

No relevant planning history.

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 10 letters to neighbouring occupants. No representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc. in response to notification and publicity of the application.

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
2. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Design & impact on the character and appearance of the area

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, including roof extensions, 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 bulk, massing, design and choice of materials for the proposed the extension would be subordinate in scale and respect the scale, form and character of the host building and the wider area. The proposal is therefore acceptable with regards to design.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

London Plan 2021 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.

Development Management DPD 2017 Policy DM1 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.

It is acknowledged that the proposed enlargement would not result in an excessive projection beyond the existing two storey rear outrigger and along the shared boundary with No 71, therefore it would not materially impact on the amenity of the occupiers of No 71. There is a degree of overshadowing and restricted outlook due to the presence of the two storey outriggers.

In relation to No 75 the extension would be situated along the shared boundary and project a depth of 7.3m and have a height of 3.1m which is considered excessive and would create a tunnelling/ enclosing effect, given this neighbouring property does not have any such extension. Because of the narrow width of the rear lightwells to these properties, the side wall of the extension of such an infill side extension would sit extremely close to the rear and side ground floor windows / door to this property.

Conditions of light and outlook from these opening are already constrained by the two-storey outrigger to the application, but by virtue of such a side extension in terms of its depth and height, it would render this impact much more acute.

The effect would be an overbearing and enclosing effect on outlook, due to the greater height and mass compared to the current fence. Equally it is noted that the backs of these properties are north

facing, meaning current light conditions are restricted. Given the above the proposal is not considered acceptable in terms of amenity.

Conclusions

The proposed infill extension would be by reason of siting, depth and height be unacceptably harmful in terms of loss of outlook and light and increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No 75.

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

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed infill extension would, by reason of siting, depth and height, be unacceptably harmful in terms of loss of outlook and light and increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No 75 property, contrary to policies of Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).