



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0203
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	Flat 1, 84 Hillfield Avenue, Hornsey, London, N8 7DN
Proposal:	Demolition of rear conservatory. Erection of rear extension with sedum roof. Alteration to front door position to replace 1no. bathroom window with internal alterations to add 1no. bedroom. Erection of outbuilding in the rear garden. (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	30/01/2026
Applicant:	Ruhul Chowdhury <ruhul.c.15@gmail.com>
Agent:	Mr Damon Peddar

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises a self-contained flat at lower ground floor level within a three-storey mid-terraced residential building on the western side of Hillfield Avenue. The site is located within the Hillfield Conservation Area.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing rear conservatory, the erection of a single-storey rear extension with a sedum roof, the repositioning of the front entrance door to replace an existing bathroom window, associated internal alterations to create an additional bedroom, and the erection of a garden outbuilding within the rear garden.

The proposed rear extension would replace the existing conservatory and extend across the full width of the property. It would measure 3m in height to the eaves and 3.15m in height to the top of the sedum roof, which would be planted with a Coral Carpet sedum mix. The extension would project 3m along the boundary with No. 82 Hillfield Avenue and 3.35m along the boundary with No. 86 Hillfield Avenue. The extension would be constructed in London stock brick and would provide an enlarged open-plan kitchen/living area together with a second bedroom.

The front entrance door would be relocated along the front elevation at lower ground floor level, replacing an existing bathroom window. This alteration would facilitate internal reconfiguration, including the creation of a new corridor and the removal of the existing bathroom, thereby allowing for the provision of the additional bedroom within the proposed rear extension. The existing entrance door would be retained.

A garden room is also proposed at the rear of the garden. The outbuilding would measure 6.43m in width and 3m in depth, providing approximately 17sqm of floorspace. It would be set slightly away from the shared boundaries and would have a maximum height of 2.5m.

The outbuilding would be finished in black timber cladding and incorporate metal-framed glazed doors and windows beneath a sedum roof. It is considered to represent a high-quality contemporary addition that is appropriate to its garden setting.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

84, Hillfield Avenue

HGY/1999/1143

Proposal: Retention of rear conservatory. (Erected without authority)

Decision Date: 2 November 1999

Decision: Approve with Conditions

Flat 3, 84 Hillfield Avenue

HGY/2024/0951

Proposal: Replacement of existing 3no. white timber sash windows to rear elevation with matching new 3no. white uPVC double glazed sash windows at the first floor level in Flat 3 (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)

Decision Date: 5 August 2024

Decision: Approve with Conditions

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH Arboricultural Officer: No objection - The Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement (AMS) Report by Marcus Arboricultural Design & Consultancy, dated May 2026, confirmed that there is a 5% encroachment into the Lime tree T1 with the outbuilding, so the Arboricultural Officer has queried the foundation design. The applicant has confirmed that it would be piled foundations with a suspended/cantilevered ground beam. The Arboricultural Officer confirmed that they have no objection to this.
- LBH Conservation Officer: They advised that the applicant needs to provide more details on the front elevation because it lacked details on the concrete, lintel and brick, the brick piers would need to be preserved, the concrete lintel would need to be retained, the chamfered edges above the windows and door will need to be incorporated into the proposed design, and the drawings lacked details of the current proposed new design. Revised drawings were provided that provided these details, for which the Conservation Officer stated that the elevation is much more detailed and shows the retention of the existing piers and lintels. A condition will be imposed for the materials on the front elevation to exactly match the existing in terms of colour, texture size etc.

Neighbour consultation

The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses 1

Objecting 1

The following issues were raised in representations and are addressed further on in this report or below:

- Structural Integrity and Safety – concerns that the application lacks a detailed structural engineering report and structural method statement, with potential implications for the stability of the building and safety of residents.

(Officer Comment: The concerns regarding potential structural impacts are noted. Structural engineering matters, construction methodology and building safety fall within the remit of the Building Regulations and Building Control regime rather than the planning process. The principal structural works associated with the proposal comprise the formation of enlarged openings at lower ground floor level to improve the relationship between the existing accommodation and the proposed rear extension. Any such works will be required to comply with the relevant Building Regulations and structural requirements. Any matters relating to shared structures or party walls are controlled under separate legislation, including the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, and are not material planning considerations.)

- Noise, Dust and Disturbance – concerns that ongoing works have resulted in excessive noise, vibration, dust and debris, adversely affecting occupiers, and that no Construction Management Plan has been submitted.
- (Officer Comment: The concerns are noted. However, the proposed development comprises a relatively small-scale residential extension, alterations to a single flat and a modest garden outbuilding. Given the scale and nature of the development, it is not considered reasonable or necessary to require a Construction Management Plan. Construction activities remain subject to separate environmental protection and statutory nuisance legislation. An informative restricting hours of construction will be attached to any permission granted.)
- Shared Building Infrastructure – concerns that the submitted plans do not adequately address the impact upon communal structural elements, shared services and electricity meters. (Officer Comment: Matters relating to communal services, utility infrastructure, electricity meters and private arrangements between owners and occupiers are not material planning considerations. Any necessary alterations would need to comply with the relevant statutory and technical requirements outside the planning process.)
- Premature and Unauthorised Works – concerns that works have commenced prior to the granting of planning permission and before assessments and consultations have been completed. (Officer Comment: The applicant's agent has confirmed that works undertaken to date have been limited to internal alterations. As the property is not a listed building, internal works do not require planning permission and do not form part of the assessment of this application. The current proposal has therefore been assessed on its planning merits.)
- Structural Report and Construction Management Plan – request that the application be refused or deferred until an independent structural engineer's report and Construction Management Plan have been submitted.
- (Officer Comment: The Local Planning Authority does not consider either a structural engineering report or Construction Management Plan necessary to determine this application. The proposal is limited in scale and raises no planning concerns that would justify such requirements. Structural matters are addressed through the Building

Regulations process and the development can be assessed satisfactorily on the basis of the information submitted.)

Officer Comment: The Council is satisfied that the statutory ownership notification requirements have been met. Notice was served on 84 Hillfield Avenue Limited, the freeholder and owner of the relevant leasehold interests. Furthermore, the proposed development has been assessed having special regard to the desirability of preserving the character and appearance of the Hillfield Conservation Area. The proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not result in harm to its significance.

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & heritage

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

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 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, the policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

Rear Extension

- Single-storey rear extensions of a similar scale and form are a common feature of properties within the surrounding area, including adjoining properties. In reaching this recommendation, considerable importance and weight has been given to the statutory duty to preserve the character and appearance of the Hillfield Conservation Area.

The proposed rear extension would be constructed in reclaimed London stock brick, together with contemporary elements including a sedum roof and black metal-framed glazing. The rear elevation would incorporate black metal-framed sliding doors. The extension would be modest in scale, subordinate to the host building, and would read as a secondary addition to the original building.

The proposed materials and design would complement the host property whilst adopting a contemporary architectural approach that is appropriate to its rear-garden setting. By reason of its modest scale, high-quality design and limited visibility from the public realm, the extension would not harm the character and appearance of the Hillfield Conservation Area, leaving it preserved.

Repositioned Front Door

- Revised drawings have been submitted showing the front elevation in greater detail, including the treatment of the existing lintels, concrete elements, brickwork and brick piers. The revised design

retains the existing piers and lintels and incorporates the architectural detailing identified by the Conservation Officer as important features of the building.

The front door would be repositioned at lower ground floor level to facilitate internal alterations to the flat. The existing entrance door would be retained. Subject to a condition requiring all external materials to match the existing building in respect of colour, texture, bonding and finish, the proposal would not harm the appearance of the host building, the street scene, or the character and appearance of the Hillfield Conservation Area, leaving it preserved.

Garden Room

- The proposed garden room would be modest in scale and comparable to structures commonly found within rear gardens in the locality. Whilst outbuildings of this nature may frequently be erected under permitted development rights at dwellinghouses, such rights do not apply to flats and therefore planning permission is required in this instance.

The garden room is considered to be of a high-quality contemporary design. Its black timber-clad external finish, metal-framed glazing and sedum roof would be appropriate to its garden setting and would integrate successfully with the surrounding built form and landscaping.

The proposal would remain subordinate to the host building and is consistent with the established pattern of development in the area, where a number of outbuildings are situated within rear gardens. Owing to its modest scale, sympathetic design and limited visibility from the public realm, the garden room would not harm the character and appearance of the Hillfield Conservation Area, leaving it preserved.

The submitted floor plans identify the structure as a garden room, which would be incidental to the residential use of the application property. Whilst the plans show a rear door opening towards Lightfoot Road, the nature and scale of the accommodation are such that it is capable of serving only an incidental purpose. In the interests of proper planning control, a condition will be imposed restricting the use of the outbuilding to purposes incidental to the residential use of Flat 1, 84 Hillfield Avenue.

Conclusion

- Overall, the proposed rear extension, front elevation alterations and garden room are considered to be well-designed, proportionate and subordinate additions. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the host building and the Hillfield Conservation Area and would not result in harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.

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.

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 the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Rear Extension

The proposed rear extension would be similar in depth and scale to the existing neighbouring rear extensions at Nos. 82 and 86 Hillfield Avenue. Given its modest height and projection, the extension would not result in an unacceptable loss of light, outlook or sense of enclosure to neighbouring occupiers.

Furthermore, the proposed extension would replace an existing conservatory and would remain subordinate to the host building. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in any material harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of overshadowing, overbearing impact, loss of outlook or loss of privacy.

Garden Room

The proposed garden room would be modest in scale and limited in height, measuring a maximum of 2.5m. Owing to its siting at the rear of the garden, its separation from neighbouring dwellings, and its limited height, the structure would not result in any unacceptable impact on neighbouring occupiers in terms of light, outlook or enclosure.

Whilst the structure would be partially visible above the boundary treatments, views would be softened by the presence of existing mature trees and landscaping within surrounding gardens. Given its scale, design and location, the garden room would not give rise to any material harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Overall, the proposed development would not result in any material harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and is therefore considered to comply with London Plan Policy D6 and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD.

Impact on trees

The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment which identifies a neighbouring mature Common Lime tree (T1) and two ornamental shrubs located outside the application site. Tree T1 is categorised as a BS5837 Category C tree and has been heavily pollarded, with no overhanging canopy extending into the site. The proposed garden room would result in only a minor incursion (less than 5%) into the tree's Root Protection Area (RPA), with no requirement for tree removal or pruning.

The submitted assessment concludes that the proposal would have a limited and acceptable arboricultural impact, subject to the implementation of the recommended tree protection measures and precautionary working methods during construction.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has reviewed the proposal and raises no objection, subject to the use of piled foundations with a suspended/cantilevered ground beam. Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable in arboricultural terms and would not result in significant harm to the health, stability or amenity value of the retained Lime tree.

Conclusion

The proposed development is considered acceptable in design, heritage and arboricultural terms and would not harm the character and appearance of the Hillfield Conservation Area. The proposal would not result in material harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and would have an acceptable impact on the retained Lime tree. All other relevant planning policies and material considerations, including equalities duties, have been taken into account. Accordingly, planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above.

6. CIL

N/A – Under 100 sqm.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed below, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Approved drawings list: 01, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, A-203, A-204, and AIA/MF/0118/26.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

- 4 The external materials to be used for the proposed development on the front elevation shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the conservation area consistent with Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies DM1 and DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

- 5 The outbuilding hereby approved shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental to the residential use of the dwelling known as Flat 1, 84 Hillfield Avenue. For the avoidance of doubt the structure shall not be utilised for any purposes which one would expect to be accommodated within the main dwelling such as sleeping or short-term let accommodation.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the character of the locality and the amenities of occupiers of adjoining residential properties.

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations, mitigation measures and precautionary working methods set out

within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (Marcus Foster Arboricultural Design & Consultancy, Ref. AIA/MF/0118/26, May 2026) and the associated Tree Protection Plan. This shall include the use of piled foundations with a suspended/cantilevered ground beam for the garden room, together with all approved tree protection measures. Tree protection fencing shall be installed prior to the commencement of development and retained for the duration of the construction works. No materials, plant, machinery, spoil or excavated material shall be stored within the Root Protection Area of Tree T1.

Reason: To safeguard the retained Common Lime tree (T1) and its Root Protection Area during construction, in the interests of tree protection and local visual amenity.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-
8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday
and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Outbuildings and Building Regulations

Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the relevant provisions of Building Regulations which can apply in relation to certain outbuildings in terms of size, use and proximity to a boundary.