



## Officer Report

|                            |                                             |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | <b>HGY/2023/2547</b>                        |
| <b>Application Type:</b>   | <b>Householder planning permission</b>      |
| <b>Address:</b>            | 105 Inderwick Road, Hornsey, London, N8 9LA |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Proposed two storey rear extension          |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Sabelle Adjagboni                           |
| <b>Valid Date:</b>         | 22/09/2023                                  |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mr Ricky Horner                             |
| <b>Agent:</b>              | Mr Stephen Starkey                          |

### **RECOMMENDATION**

#### **Refuse**

##### **1. Proposed development**

This is an application for a proposed two-storey rear extension.

##### **2.Site and Surroundings**

The application site is a two-storey terrace property located on Inderwick Road closer to its northern end and near the intersection with Weston Park Road. The site is not in a conservation area. Different ground floor rear extensions and roof extensions of various sizes can be seen on the backs of properties here.

##### **3.Relevant Planning and Enforcement history**

The relevant planning history in relation to the site is as follows:

HGY/2023/2548 | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 2.95m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.8m | Not required.

HGY/2023/2429 | Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed formation of dormer extensions to the main rear roof and the rear outrigger roof and the installation of three rooflight on the front roof slope. | Approved.

There is no enforcement history in relation to the site.

##### **4. Consultation response**

No responses were received following consultation on the application.

##### **5. Local representations**

The application was publicised by way of 12 letters to neighbours. No representations were received.

##### **6. Material planning considerations**

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance, &

## 2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

### Design and 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 would 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.

### Ground floor extension

The proposed ground floor extension would be 1.1m deep across the width of the outrigger. The facing materials would match the existing. Given its modest depth and presence in this street of single storey rear extensions of various sizes, it is considered that the ground floor element of the proposal would be acceptable and not detract from the appearance of the building or the character of the area.

### First floor extension

The proposed first floor extension follows the depth of the ground floor, also featuring matching materials. Given the terrace generally possesses a uniformity of character by reason of the siting and arrangement of mirroring two-storey outriggers which sit in line to form a consistent building line, the addition of a first-floor extension here would be at odds with this pattern of development.

While the backs of the properties here have been altered at ground and roof level no such alterations have been carried out at this level, and as such this is a feature viewed important to protect.

While the extension here is small in depth and size it would nonetheless unbalance the symmetry of the pair of outriggers and introduce an element which would disrupt the existing rhythm and pattern of development to the rear elevations of this terrace of properties.

For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, in design terms, the proposal, in so far as it relates to the first-floor element, is considered at odds with the above policies.

### 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. 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.

The proposal is fairly small in size and therefore its depth would have a negligible impact on conditions of daylight and sunlight to the adjoining/ neighbouring properties. Additionally, there would be no new overlooking/ loss of privacy.

Overall, the proposal would have no material impact on amenity, in terms of privacy, conditions of daylight and sunlight, and outlook. As such, the proposal is considered in line with the above policies.

## **Conclusion**

The proposed development by virtue of introducing a first-floor extension, would be uncharacteristic within the context of the character and appearance of this terrace, specifically harming the proportions, rhythm, and rear building line associated with current outriggers, as such contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (adopted 2017), and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

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

## **7. CIL Applicable**

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.

## **8.Recommendation**

REFUSE PERMISSION

### **Refusal Reasons:**

The proposed development by virtue of introducing a first-floor extension, would be uncharacteristic within the context of the character and appearance of this terrace, specifically harming the proportions, rhythm, and rear building line associated with current outriggers, as such contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (adopted 2017), and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.