



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0584
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	76 Muswell Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2BE
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension.
Case Officer:	Mark Chan
Valid Date:	26/03/2026
Applicant:	Mr Paul Berkovi
Agent:	Mrs Amber Short

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is an application for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey, mid-terraced dwellinghouse located on the southeastern side of Muswell Road. The property has an existing rear dormer, a two-storey central rear outrigger, a small 1.5m deep single storey rear extension with roof terrace and balustrade on the western side and front and rear rooflights. The site is within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area (CA) but not a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

HGY/2026/1320 – Removal of 4 trees in the rear garden: A cherry plum tree, a western red cedar tree, a plum tree and a honey locust. No objection 02/07/2026.

HGY/2025/1456 – Removal of a laurel tree in the front garden and removal of a cypress tree in the rear garden near the rear wall of the property. No objection 23/06/2025.

HGY/2013/0936 – Erection of single storey rear conservatory extension. Approved 18/06/2013.

78 Muswell Road

HGY/2021/1539 – Rear extension and loft conversion with dormer (AMENDED DESCRIPTION). Approved 28/07/2021.

Proposal

This application is seeking consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension only. No new first-floor rear terrace is proposed.

The main issues with this application are the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, as discussed below.

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

LBH Conservation Officer – The proposed extension is large and would project from the central outrigger. It would dominate the rear elevation of the original house and erode the building form. Because of the existing alterations, the extension should better relate to the host building and allow the rear outrigger to remain appreciable. As proposed, the proposal would cause some harm to the significance of the Muswell Hill CA. The large mature trees in the rear garden should not be harmed as a result of the proposed development.

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of letters, site notice and press advert. 2 objections in response to notification and publicity of the application were received. The reasons for objection are summarised as follows:

- Excessive depth and scale of the proposed rear extension
- Harm to the character and appearance of the Muswell Hill CA
- First-floor terrace not included in the development description
- First-floor terrace would result in overlooking of neighbouring gardens
- Proposed extension will result in removal of trees
- The construction works would be disruptive and intrusive to neighbours
- No Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted
- No Arboricultural Impact Assessment submitted
- No Surface Water Drainage Strategy submitted and increased flood risk

4. PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Policy Considerations

This application is being considered against Local Plan Policy SP11 'Design' and DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' which requires buildings/ structures to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality and to safeguard neighbouring amenity. Equally and more specifically it is being considered against DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' which 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.

In terms of amenity London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policy DM1 both emphasise the importance of protecting amenity of surrounding housing. Policy D6 highlights the need to consider daylight, sunlight, and overshadowing effects on neighbouring properties, ensuring they receive sufficient light appropriate for their context while minimising overshadowing. Similarly, DPD Policy DM1 stresses the requirement for high-quality design to guarantee privacy and amenity for both the development's users and neighbouring residents. This includes providing adequate sunlight, daylight, and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, while also ensuring an appropriate level of privacy to prevent overlooking and maintain the amenity of neighbouring properties.

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.

Design and Heritage

The proposed rear extension would span the width of the host property and have a stepped rear elevation with a maximum depth of 5.9m on the eastern side abutting No. 78 Muswell Road and 4.8m deep (3.3m from the rear elevation of the existing rear extension) on the western side abutting No. 74 Muswell Road. The new extension would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 3.25m. It would be finished in London yellow brickwork and Crittall style aluminium doors.

It is observed there are many similar rear extensions on this side road and their designs are inconsistent with some of them more traditional and some of the very contemporary. The principle of a new single storey rear extension is in keeping with the pattern of development on this section of Muswell Road. Whilst the depth of the new extension would be deeper than the rear extension at the adjacent No. 78 by 0.6m, given the size of the host property and the rear garden, the new extension is still considered to be subordinate and proportionate to the host property and not dominate the rear elevation. The design and materials of the extension and rear fenestrations are also considered to be high quality and would not harm the character and appearance of the host property.

The Council's Conservation Officer has commented that the new extension would erode the building form and allow the existing rear outrigger to remain appreciable. However, it is noted that ground floor of the host property has already been altered and a rear conservatory was also approved in 2013. Furthermore, the 19th century form of the rear outrigger at the application site has already been lost through the vertical extension and

construction of the existing rear dormer. Unfortunately, this has happened to most of the properties in this terrace and there is now not a consistent rear elevation design. Combining with the facts that the proposal is to the rear of the property with limited public view and that many neighbouring properties already have full-width rear extensions, it is not considered the proposal would adversely impact the street scene nor cause further material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and wider CA.

Therefore, the design and massing of this new rear extension are considered acceptable in design and heritage terms on this occasion.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

No. 78 Muswell Road has an existing 5.3m deep single storey rear extension built up to the site boundary. The proposed development would only be 0.6m deeper and thus would not appear overbearing nor result in any material increase in overshadowing, loss of privacy or daylight/sunlight to No. 78.

No. 74 Muswell Road does not have a rear extension built up to the site boundary. To assess the impact on amenities at No. 74, the applicant has submitted drawings showing a 45-degree horizontal line drawn from the centre of the nearest ground floor window at No. 74 to the site. The line would intercept the existing 1.5m deep rear extension at the site and the existing boundary wall. It is also noted that the new extension is only approximately 1m deeper than the rear elevation of central outrigger. Due to ground level difference, the rear extension would only appear to be 2.65m in height from the view of No. 74. Therefore, given that the relatively low height of the new extension when viewed from No. 74, the fact that the existing rear extension and boundary wall already breaches the 45-degree line, and that the new extension is only 1m deeper than the outrigger, the proposed development is not considered to materially nor adversely impact the amenities of the occupiers of No. 74 with regards to increased sense of enclosure or loss of sunlight/daylight. It is observed there is a ground floor side window in the rear outrigger at No. 74, but this is a slot window with frosted glazing and is understood to serve a storage area and downstairs bathroom. Based on the above and the relatively minor scale of the proposal, it is not considered a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment is necessary and the proposal would not appear overbearing nor materially increase the overshadowing, loss of privacy or daylight/sunlight to No. 74.

Objection concerning the first-floor terrace would result in overlooking of neighbouring gardens has been received. However, as explained in the above section, the first-floor roof terrace together with the rear extension are existing features that would be retained at the host property. It is not part of the current application and is not considered to introduce additional overlooking of neighbouring properties.

Objection concerning the construction works would be disruptive and intrusive to neighbours has been received. Given the relatively minor scale of the proposal, it is not considered that the construction of the proposed scheme would be overly disruptive or intrusive to local residents and traffic. A construction and logistics management plan is not considered necessary. An informative reminding the applicant of the permitted hours of noisy work has been included in the decision.

The impact on neighbouring amenities is considered acceptable on this occasion.

Trees and Landscaping

London Plan Policy G7 requires existing trees of value to be retained, and any removal to be compensated by adequate replacement. This policy further sets out that planting of new trees, especially those with large canopies, should be included within development proposals. DPD Policy DM1 requires proposals demonstrate how landscaping and planting are integrated into a development as a whole, responding to trees on and close to the site.

Objection concerning the proposed extension would result in the removal of trees on site was received. The applicant has explained a separate “Works to trees in Conservation Area” application ref: HGY/2026/1320 for the removal of a honey locus, western red cedar, plum tree in the rear garden was approved on 02/07/2026 by the Council. As a result, the trees will be felled and removed from the site based on this previous consent. The current application does not involve the removal of any additional trees and no other trees are impacted on by the current proposal. The submission of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan is therefore not considered to be necessary.

Sustainable Drainage

Objection concerning the lack of surface water drainage strategy and increased flood risk has been received. Whilst the site is located on the overland flow route, it is within Flood Zone 1 which represents the lowest official risk rating for river and sea flooding. Given the local sloping topography, the scale and footprint of the proposed extension, and size of the rear garden, it is not considered likely to result in surface water flooding due to blockage of the route or concentration of surface water at the site. A surface water drainage strategy is not considered necessary on this occasion.

Conclusion

The proposed development is in general accordance with Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017, and Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey’s Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also accords with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

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

5. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A – Under 100sqm no new unit.

6. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to 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 completed in accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed below except where conditions to this planning permission indicate otherwise or where alternative details have been subsequently approved following an application for an non-material amendment.

Approved Plans & Document List:

1076/101 Rev A – 45 Degree Assessment);
1076/110 Rev A – Site Location & Proposed Block Plan;
1076/111 Rev A – Existing Ground Floor Plan;
1076/112 – Existing First Floor Plan;
1076/113 Rev A – Existing Loft Floor Plan;
1076/121 Rev A – Existing Front Elevation;
1076/122 Rev A – Existing Rear Elevation;
1076/131 Rev A – Existing Section AA;
1076/132 Rev A – Existing Section BB;
1076/211 Rev A – Proposed Ground Floor Plan;
1076/212 Rev A – Proposed First Floor Plan;
1076/213 Rev A – Proposed Loft Floor Plan;
1076/221 Rev A – Proposed Front Elevation;
1076/222 Rev A – Proposed Rear Elevation;
1076/231 Rev A – Proposed Section AA;
1076/232 Rev A – Proposed Section BB; &
Design, Access & Heritage Statement.

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 unless specified in the approved drawings.

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.

Informatives:

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: 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.