

DESIGN STATEMENT

PLANNING APPLICATION

72 PRIORY ROAD, LONDON N8 7EY



william I carter^{ltd}

First Floor
9 Belsize Park
London
NW3 4ES
020 7813 3349
info@william-carter.com

1. Introduction

This design statement is submitted in support of a planning application for the demolition of the existing garage and utility room at the above address and the construction of a new side extension in their place housing a study and utility room.

This application follows on from a householder application (ref: HGY/2023/1338), which was refused by the Council on the following grounds:

“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 street scene 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)”.

We do not share the view of the Council in this regard and have appealed their decision. We feel the limited extent of the proposed development covered by the householder application was conflated with permitted development rights conferred on the property by the General Permitted Development Order and which did not form part of the application under review.

The existing structures at the property are in a state of disrepair and need to be rebuilt. The existing garage to the front of the property is too small to fulfil its intended function and the utility room to the rear is of timber and brick construction and derelict. Currently, both structures have a detrimental impact on the streetscene. In order to find a solution acceptable to all parties concerned, a pre-application showing revised proposals was submitted to the Council under reference: PRE/2023/0142. The Council has confirmed that these proposals are acceptable in a response letter dated 10 August 2023 (Please see enclosed). In addition, the Council proposed an alternative option which they confirmed would also be acceptable, being to set the proposed side extension back from the front elevation of the existing building by a

further 500mm (to a total of 1000mm) and to increase the width of the extension by 600mm up to the boundary with Park Avenue North. The proposals submitted as part of this planning application are in line with the Council's alternative option.

2. Amended Approach

In light of the comments in the delegated report in respect of householder application ref: HGY/2023/1338, the following changes have been made to the proposals:

- a. The height of the proposed extension has been significantly reduced.
- b. The front elevation of the proposed extension has been set back from the front elevation of the existing building by 1000mm, in line with the Council's recommendation.

The new structures are of a similar size to the existing.

3. Delegated Report – Householder application (Ref: HGY/2023/1338)

The officer's delegated report identifies two main areas for consideration in respect of the proposed scheme: 1) Design and appearance, and 2) Impact on neighbouring amenity.

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenity, the report concludes at Paragraph 5.9 that the proposed extension will not result in a *"loss in privacy or overshadowing"* and that, *"there are no side facing windows proposed that would cause issues of overlooking or overshadowing"*.

Paragraph 5.10 of the delegated report concludes that, *"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"*.

In terms of design and appearance, the delegated report concludes at Paragraph 5.5 that, *"The material choice of the proposal would match the host dwellinghouse and would appear sensitive to the surrounding area"*.

The sole reason given in the delegated report for the refusal of the householder application relates to an assessment that as a result of its scale and bulk, the proposed extension would fail to appear subordinate to the host property and would constitute an overdevelopment of the site.

In addressing this concern, we have sought to reduce the size of the proposed extension, whilst retaining the same material palette as previously proposed and that was found to be sensitive to the surrounding area in the delegated report.

4. Scale

In terms of scale, the proposed extension is now of a similar size to the existing structures it is replacing. A comparison of these structures can be summarised as follows:

- a. The combined length of the existing structures to be demolished is 10.35m. The proposed extension will have a length of 9.85m.
- b. The maximum height of the existing structures is 3m. The proposed extension would have a height along its length of 3.05m in the location of the existing garage and 3.1m in the location of the existing utility room. The maximum height of the proposed extension (3.7m) referred to in the delegated report, relates solely to the apex of the front façade and has now been reduced to 3.4m.
- c. The existing structures have a footprint of 30.7sqm. The proposed extension has a footprint of 34.3sqm.

As set out in the design statement submitted as part of the householder application, the existing garage is too small to fulfil its intended function and to house a car. It is therefore only suitable for storage. The modest increase in width proposed in this area will provide more usable internal space, taking account of the additional thickness of the structure required to construct the new extension. Similarly, the small increase in the height of the new structures will allow for satisfactory internal headroom, taking account of the thickness of structure now required for roofs.

5. Proposed Use

The proposed scheme involves the demolition of the existing utility room at the property. This will be replaced with a utility room of the same size.

The creation of a study at the property in replacement of the existing garage will be an improvement on the current arrangement and is in line with planning guidance, which supports the creation of adequate space for home working. As detailed above, the existing garage is not functional and is only suitable for storage.

6. Conclusion

The delegated report in respect of householder application ref: HGY/2023/1338, concludes that the proposed extension would not result in a *“loss in privacy or overshadowing”* and that, *“there are no side facing windows proposed that would cause issues of overlooking or overshadowing”*.

The delegated report further confirms that the proposed side extension would not 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”*.

In terms of the appearance of the proposed extension, the delegated report confirms that the proposed materials *“match the host dwellinghouse and would appear sensitive to the surrounding area”*.

The existing structures which are to be demolished are incongruous in their design, are of poor quality and are in a state of disrepair. It is not possible to attempt repairs to these structures and due to their design, reinstating them in their current form would not be of benefit. The appearance of these structures from the public footway is extremely poor and has a negative impact on the streetscene.

The proposed extension is of a similar size to the structures being demolished and utilises materials which the Council considers sensitive to the surrounding area.

In terms of usage, the proposed scheme will create a study in replacement of the existing garage, which is too small to fulfil its purpose and is therefore only suitable for storage. The creation of a study is in accordance with planning guidance which supports the creation of adequate space for home working.

It is unclear what other option there is for these derelict structures, other than to replace them with new structures of a similar size, in materials that are more attractive and in a manner that improves the functionality of the floorspace.

As set out in the pre-application response dated 10 August 2023, the Council has confirmed that the proposals contained within this application are acceptable.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel Cheifetz', with a stylized, flowing script.

Daniel Cheifetz