# Officer Report

| | |
|---|---|
| **Application Number:** | **HGY/2026/2620** |
| **Application Type:** | **Householder planning permission** |
| **Address:** | 4 View Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4DA |
| **Proposal:** | Extension of the existing ground floor side projection including installation of associated rooflight windows in the side extension. Reconfiguration of ground floor rear elevation including replacing existing doors with sliding doors. Installation of solar panels to flat roof of the second floor existing rear dormer. Installation of air source heat pump. |
| **Case Officer:** | Josh Parker |
| **Valid Date:** | 02/10/202<br>6 |
| **Applicant:** | Loustau |
| **Agent:** | Mr Peter Lynn |

## RECOMMENDATION

**Approve with Conditions**

### SITE AND SURROUNDING

The site is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse situated on the southern side of View Road. The property is residential in character and forms part of a group of traditional late Victorian suburban townscape of the area.

The property has been subject to a number of historic alterations, including a single-storey rear and side extension and a rear roof dormer.

The site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area.

### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The applicant is proposing the following works to the dwelling:

Extension of the existing ground floor side projection including installation of associated rooflight windows in the side extension. Reconfiguration of ground floor rear elevation including replacing existing doors with new sliding doors. Installation of new solar panels to flat roof of the second floor existing rear dormer. Installation of new air source heat pump.

The extension is single storey with a monopitched roof with 7 rooflights.

### SITE HISTORY AND ENFOREMENT

All planning applications have been considered for this application.

HGY/2012/1144 - Erection of rear single storey ground floor extension
Decision Made - Approve with Conditions - 29/10/2012

HGY/2012/2460 - Erection of single storey rear side extension (householder application)
Decision Made - Refuse - 6/3/2013

HGY/2013/1268 - Formation of rear dormer and insertion of 2 rooflights to side roofslope
Decision Made - Approve with Conditions - 13/8/2013

HGY/2013/2514 - Erection of a side infill to the ground floor of house to provide a garage.
Decision Made - Approve with Conditions - 15/1/2014

HGY/2015/0658 - Replacement of existing front garden fence. Decision Made - Refuse - 24/4/2015

Officer note:

A 2026 Pre application was made for a ground floor side extension and rooflights

**CONSULTATION**

LBH conservation: No comment

**LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

The application has been publicised by the way of site/press notice and letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

Objections:1
Support:0

Objections summarised:

- Concerns that the extension would create a substantial flank wall close to the boundary, resulting in increased enclosure and loss of daylight/sunlight to the garden and patio of No. 6.
- Notes that no daylight, sunlight or overshadowing assessment has been provided and that the impact on No. 6 has not been properly assessed.
- Raises concerns that the submitted plans may understate the separation distance between the extension and the boundary.
- Objects to the relocation of the kitchen within the extension, citing potential noise disturbance and cooking odours from side-facing windows and rooflights close to No. 6's patio area.

**MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and heritage;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;

**Design and heritage:**

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 sensitivedesign quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, 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 DM1 ‘Delivering High Quality Design’ requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6. DPD Policy D9 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

The application seeks planning permission for the extension of the existing ground floor side projection by approximately 1.44m, installation of additional rooflights within the side extension roof, reconfiguration of rear elevation fenestration, installation of solar panels on the existing rear dormer roof, and installation of an air source heat pump within the side passage of the property. The site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located within the Highgate Conservation Area.

The proposed side infill extension would follow the established building line of the existing side extension and would align with the existing side wall, creating a more unified built form. The extension would retain the existing single-storey scale and mono-pitch roof arrangement, matching the design, proportions and materials of the existing extension. Seven rooflights are proposed within the roof slope.

The external alterations are modest in nature and largely contained to the side and rear elevations which are not readily visible from the public realm. The proposal does not alter the principal frontage and would preserve the established architectural character of the dwelling. The extension has been designed to utilise materials that match the existing property, including the reuse of existing bricks where possible, ensuring the development appears as a sympathetic continuation of the host building.

The replacement of the existing rear doors and windows with aluminium-framed sliding doors would result in a more coherent rear elevation while remaining confined to the private rear garden elevation. The proposed solar panels would be installed on the flat roof of the existing rear dormer and would have limited visibility from public viewpoints, equally could be instated under permitted development rights (Class A).

Having regard to the scale, siting, design and materiality of the proposals, officers consider that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would preserve the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD and Policy HC1 of the London Plan.

**Amenity Comments**

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. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

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 amenity of neighbouring resident.

Extension and associated works

With regard to the physical relationship between the proposal and No. 6, the extension would not be constructed on the shared boundary but would retain a separation distance of approximately 1 metre. The height of the extension at this point ranges from approximately 2.9 metres to 3.7 metres, which is considered modest for a single-storey addition and is comparable to boundary treatments and extensions commonly found within the surrounding residential area.

In terms of outlook and enclosure, whilst the extension would inevitably alter the existing relationship between the properties to a limited degree, officers do not consider the scale, height or siting of the development to result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure when viewed from the garden or rear patio serving No. 6. The extension remains subordinate in scale and would not give rise to a dominant or overbearing form of development. Having regard to its single-storey nature, retained set-back from the boundary and overall dimensions, officers are satisfied that any impact would be limited and would not warrant refusal.

With respect to daylight and sunlight, officers acknowledge that the proposal would introduce additional built form within the side passage. However, given the modest height of the extension, its position approximately 1 metre from the shared boundary, and the open nature of the adjoining garden, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a material loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring habitable rooms or external amenity areas. As such, a formal BRE daylight and sunlight assessment is not considered necessary in this instance.

Concerns have also been raised regarding noise and cooking odours associated with the relocation of the kitchen. Officers note that the proposal relates to the continued use of the property as a single-family dwellinghouse, with the kitchen remaining ancillary to that lawful residential use. The generation of typical domestic noise and cooking odours is an ordinary and expected characteristic of residential occupation within an established urban environment. The proposal is not considered likely to generate noise, odour or general disturbance beyond that reasonably associated with the occupation of a dwellinghouse and no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate otherwise.

The concerns raised in the objections have been fully considered but are not considered sufficient to substantiate a refusal.

Noise report or ASHP

The application is accompanied by a Noise Impact Assessment, which assesses the potential noise impacts arising from the proposed Samsung AE160CXYBEK/EU air source heat pump. The assessment identifies the nearest noise-sensitive receptor as No. 2 View Road, located approximately 2 metres from the proposed unit.

The submitted assessment concludes that, without mitigation, the operation of the heat pump could result in a significant adverse impact under BS4142:2014+A1:2019 guidance. However, the report recommends the installation of an acoustic enclosure capable of achieving a minimum insertion loss of 23dB. With this mitigation in place, the predicted rating noise level would be 25dB LAr,T, which is 10dB below the measured background noise level of 35dB LA90,T. The assessment concludes that this would represent a low impact and would comply with the London Borough of Haringey's noise requirements.

Officers are satisfied that, subject to a planning condition requiring the installation and retention of the recommended acoustic enclosure and vibration isolation measures, the air source heat pump would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity. Details confirming the specifications of this acoustic cover achieving a minimum insertion loss of 23dB will need be submitted to the council in writing to ensure the adherence to the guidance as recommended in the noise report.

Amenity conclusion

Subject to the conditions discussed above, the proposed extension and installation of the air source heat pump (ASHP) would not give rise to any material adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of noise, outlook, daylight, sunlight, privacy, or overbearing effects.

**Other Considerations**

Whilst limited weight is afforded to the carbon reduction benefits of the proposal, officers welcome the incorporation of sustainability measures designed to improve the environmental performance of the dwelling. These include the installation of a photovoltaic solar array on the roof of the existing rear dormer and the provision of an air source heat pump. Collectively, these measures would contribute towards reducing the building's operational carbon emissions and support the Council's ambition of achieving net zero carbon emissions. As such, the environmental benefits of the proposal weigh modestly in favour of the development.

**Conclusion**

Subject to conditions the proposal is considered acceptable and would preserve the conservation area. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

**CIL**

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey’s CIL charge.

**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 in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

APPROVED PLANS:
140/200A, 140/201A, 140/202B, 140/203B, 140/204A, 140/205A, 140/206, 140/208, NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT - MECHANICAL PLANT Sound Licensing Ltd,

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

3 Prior to the installation of the air source heat pump, the approved acoustic enclosure shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority which shall achieve a minimum 10dB(A) below the typical background noise level (35dB LA90,15min). The plant or ASHP shall be installed and retained and maintained thereafter. Any replacement heat pump shall achieve an equivalent or lower noise rating level than that assessed within the approved Noise Impact Assessment and shall not be installed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority unless one can be installed that aligns the permitted development perimeters.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers from noise nuisance.

**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: 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.