



Officer Report

Application Number: HGY/2026/1880
Application Type: Full planning permission
Address: Flat 2, 78 Raleigh Road, Hornsey, London, N8 0JA
Proposal: Extension to outrigger
Case Officer: Ben Coffie
Valid Date: 09/07/2026
Applicant: Mr Berliand
Agent: Mr Donald Shearer

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey terrace property which has been converted in to flats and is located on the southern side of Raleigh Road. The site is not within a conservation area and is not a listed building.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks planning permission for a further extension to a fully implemented outrigger extension granted planning permission under application ref: HGY/2024/3418 by an additional 2.9m. The outrigger currently measures 3.81m in width, 4.77m in depth and 3.05m in height and matched the depth of the outrigger extension at the adjoining property at no. 76 Raleigh Road.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

HGY/2018/3038,

Address: 78B, Raleigh Road, London, N8 0JA

Proposal: Erection of rear dormer, installation of 2 front roof lights.,

Received Date: 31 August 2018

Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/2024/1929,

Address: Flat 2, 78 Raleigh Road, Hornsey, London, N8 0JA

Proposal: Proposed erection of rear dormer and the installation of 2 front roof lights.,

Decision Date: 6 September 2024

Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/2024/3418,

Address: Flat 2, 78 Raleigh Road, Hornsey, London, N8 0JA

Proposal: Erection of rear dormer and extension to outrigger, installation of 2 front roof lights.,

Decision Date: 7 February 2025

Decision: Approve with Conditions

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

N/A

Neighbour Consultation

The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows and additional 21 days consultation was undertaken following the receipt of the amended proposal.

No of individual responses 0

Objecting 0

Support 0

Neither 0

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & appearance

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.

The proposal seeks to construct an outrigger roof extension which would occupy the entirety of the existing outrigger roof form, at odd with outrigger roof extension which occupies only part of the original outrigger roof to No 76, as such being a significantly larger intervention.

The prevailing character of the terrace is one where the rear outriggers remain clearly subordinate to the principal roof form, with the majority of properties retaining appreciable sections of the original outrigger roof. The proposed extension would remove this distinction by occupying the full extent of the outrigger roof and creating a substantially larger rear roof addition than is generally characteristic of the terrace.

As a result, the proposal would appear unduly dominant and visually intrusive when viewed from surrounding properties and the wider rear roofscape. The development would erode the established hierarchy between the main roof and the rear outrigger and would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development within the terrace and the wider street.

The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017), which seek to ensure that extensions remain subordinate to the host building and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

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.

Although the application property is separated from No. 80 Raleigh Road, being end of terrace properties, the extension here presents issues for amenity.

The development within this location and given its size would be more readily visible from neighbouring rear and side facing windows and its amenity areas.

Specifically, as the proposed extension would occupy the full extent of the existing outrigger roof it would create a noticeably larger and higher built form than currently exists. This increased scale would be readily apparent when viewed from No. 80, particularly from the rear lightwell and rear and side-facing windows, as such being overbearing.

While it is accepted that the proposal is unlikely to cause reductions in daylight or sunlight sufficient to result in a failure of BRE guidance, the increased bulk and massing would nevertheless harm outlook.

The extension would also cast a greater shadow across the lightwell space serving No. 80 as such affecting amenity.

Accordingly, notwithstanding that BRE daylight and sunlight guidance is unlikely to be breached, the proposal would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact and material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 80 Raleigh Road, contrary to London Plan Policy D6 and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

6. CONCLUSION

The proposal is considered not acceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the area, and it would result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbours, contrary to the policies outlined above. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should therefore be refused for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for refusal due to the following reasons.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed outrigger extension, by reason of its excessive additional depth, would constitute a disproportionate, bulky and overly dominant form of development which will be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and wider streetscene. As such the proposed development is considered to be contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), policies SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Plan (2017).

The proposed outrigger extension, by reason of its excessive additional depth and projection would create an overbearing form of development causing a loss of outlook to no.80 Raleigh Road, London, N8 0JA and create a generally overbearing presence when viewed from the adjacent room and terrace of that neighbour contrary to DPD Policies DM1 and DM12 and London Plan Policy D6.